N. 17.

A SERMON OF THE *BAPTIZING* of *INFANTS*;

PREACHED

In the Abbey-Church at *Westminster*, at the Morning Lecture, appointed by the Honorable House of *COMMONS*.

BY

Stephen Marshall, B.D. Minister of Gods Word, at *Finching-field* in *Essex*.

ACT. 2. 39.

The Promise is unto you and to your Children, and to all that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

ROM. 11. 16.

If the roote bee holy, so are the branches.

1 COR. 7. 14.

The unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now they are holy.

LONDON,

Printed by *Richard Cotes*, for *Stephen Bowtell*, and are to be sold at the signe of the Bible in Popes-head Alley, 1645.

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
DAVID H. McALPIN.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

DEC 3 1944

TO

The Reverend and Learned the Prolocutor, Assessors, the Commissioners of the Church of *Scotland*, and the rest of the Assembly of Divines, now sitting in *Westminster*.

SOme few of us who are of your number, freely bestowing our Labours in the Abbey-Church, every Morning; we agreed among our selves to instruct our Auditors in all the necessary Truths of that Doctrine, which is according to godlinesse; One taking for his Subject, the Articles of Faith; *Another the* Ten Commandements; *Another the* Lords Prayer, &c. *My lot of late hath been to handle the Doctrine of the* Sacraments, *and comming in order to this Point, I indevoured to cleere it as fully as I could in one Sermon, and was thereby compelled to borrow a little more time then is usually allotted to that Exercise.*

Importunity of many Friends, who conceived it might give some light to that which is now made a great controversy, and might through the blessing of

God, bee a meanes to reclaime ſome deceived Soules, or prevent the deceiving of others, hath brought it thus into Publick view.

And although I know my ſelf the unworthyeſt, and unableſt of many, yet becauſe I am aſſured that it is Gods Truth which I have Preached, and which hee will bleſſe, I was the more eaſily overcome by that importunity; if it may contribute any thing to the helping forward of the great work now under your hands and may eaſe you of any part of that Labour which ſo exceeding preſſeth you, therein I ſhall rejoyce; And in the opportunity I have by Dedicating this to your Names, to teſtify that I am

Your unworthy Brother

and Servant in the Lords work,

STEPHEN MARSHALL.

A SERMON OF THE *BAPTIZING* of *INFANTS.*

I Pet. 3. 21.

The like figure whereunto, even Baptiſme, doth alſo now ſave us, (not the putting away of the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God) by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.

IN this Morning Lecture, I have formerly in my courſe out of ſeverall Scriptures handled the Doctrine of the Sacraments in *Generall*, and then proceeded to ſpeak of the Sacraments of the *Old Teſtament*, and therein their *number*, their *agreement*, and *diſagreement*, with thoſe of the *New Teſtament*; And now lately have begun to open the Sacraments of the *New Teſtament*.

The firſt of them is now in hand; And I have already out of this Text, made foure or five Sermons, concerning the nature and uſe of the Sacrament of Baptiſme, wherein I have

have cleared unto you: Firſt, Who was the *Authour* and *Inſtitutour* of it: Secondly, Who is to be the *Miniſter* of it: Thirdly, the *Eſſence* of it, the matter and forme of it; both the *res terrena*, and the *res Cœleſtis*, the earthly, and the ſpirituall part: and now Fourthly, it remaines, that I treat of the *ſubject* of it, or the perſons who are to be Baptized; and they are of two ſorts; either *grown men*, who being inſtructed in the Doctrine of Chriſt, and profeſſing their Faith in him, and their willingnes and readines to live according to his will, and do deſire to be partakers of this bleſſed Sacrament; theſe whether Jews or Gentiles, Male or Female, bond or free, are to be admitted to the participation of this Ordinance; of the Baptizing of ſuch as theſe there is no queſtion. The other ſort are *Infants*, of whoſe right to this Sacrament, I ſhall (by Gods aſſiſtance) treate this day.

And concerning theſe, there are two ſorts of queſtions:

e Queſtion ted.

Firſt, Whether any Infants at all are to be Baptized?

Secondly, Suppoſing ſome have right to it, yet it's greatly diſputed, *whoſe* Infants may be baptized? *viz.* Whether the Infants of *Excommunicate* perſons, of *Hereticks*, of *Profane* men, of meerly *civilly Righteous*, whether *Baſtards*, whether the Infants of *Heathens, who are to bee brought up by Chriſtians*; and whether theſe may not be baptized, with ſome *caution* uſed, thereby to make diſtinction betwixt the pure and the impure? I ſhall for the preſent baulk all theſe latter queſtions, and handle only the former, *viz. Whether any at all are to bee baptized?* or, as the Queſtion uſes to be ſtated:

Whether the Infants of beleeving Parents, the Infants of Saints, are to be admitted to this Holy Sacrament? And here alſo ariſeth another queſtion, Who are to bee meant by *Beleevers* and *Saints*, whether only ſuch as have the *inward vertue* of faith and holineſſe, who are *really* beleevers and

and Sanctifyed ones, or whether by *Beleevers* and *Saints*, may be meant such a faith and Sanctity as is *outwardly professed*, although possibly the inward grace it selfe (which only God can judge of) be altogether wanting?

Concerning which question, although for my own part I beleeve we are to understand it of that which man may judge of, and that God hath not made that the condition of his servants applying his Ordinances, which can be infallibly known to none but himself, and that therefore the profession of faith and holinesse, is sufficient to make men passe for Beleevers and Saints, in the Churches judgement, yet I shall at the present baulk the handling of this also, and will take it in the surest sense, in the Apostles sense; what the *Apostle* means by Beleevers and Saints, when he writes unto the Churches, that I will take to be the state of the Question: if by Beleevers and Saints the *Apostle* mean *visible* professors of faith and holinesse; then the Question is, whether *their Infants are to bee baptized*; if the *Apostle* by Beleevers and Saints mean such only as are *inwardly* holy, *inwardly* beleevers, then the question is, whether *their Infants are to bee Baptized*; in a word, whether the Infants of *such* as were or might have been stiled Beleevers and Saints in the *Apostles* daies and writings, are to be admitted to the Sacrament of Baptisme.

The Infants Beleevers ought to bee Baptized.

This priviledge of the Baptizing of such Infants the Christian Church hath been in possession of, for the space of fifteen hundred years and upwards, as is manifest out of most of the Records that we have of antiquity, both in the Greek and Latine Church; which I the rather mention in the beginning, because many of the Anabaptists blush not to say, that the Antients, especially the Greek Church, rejected it for many hundred years: *Justine Martyr*, who lived about *Anno* 150 (in a Treatise which goes under his name) *Question* 56, disputes the different condition of those children,

The Primitive Church owned it.

who dye baptized, and of them who dye unbaptized.

Ireneus, who lived in the same Century, *Lib. 2. cap. 39.* saith, *Christus venit per seipsum omnes salvare; omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, Infantes & parvulos & pueros, &c.* Now it is well known, say the Glossers upon that Text, *renascentiæ nomine, Dominica & Apostolica phrasi, Baptismum intelligi.*

Origen, who lived in the beginning of the third Century, in his Treatise upon *Rom. 6. Lib. 5.* saith, *The Church received this Tradition of Baptizing of Infants from the Apostles:* and Homily 8. upon *Leviticus*, *Secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam, Baptismum parvulis dari concedit, Hom. 14. in Lucam, Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum*: he cals it indeed a *Tradition*, according to the expression of the Ancients, who ordinarily called the greatest points of *Faith*, by the name of Traditions received from the Apostles. Traditions being onely such things as are delivered from one to another, whether written or unwritten. And so did the Apostle himselfe, *2 Thess. 2. 15.* when he charged them to *hold the Traditions which they had been taught, either by word or Epistle.* However his calling it a Tradition received from the Apostles gives us a sufficient proofe, that time out of mind, it had been received in the Church, that it was delivered over to the Church in his time, and was of antient use in the Church before his time.

Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 40. in Baptismum, cals Baptism *signaculum vitæ cursum ineuntibus*, and commands children to be baptized, though afterward he seemed to restrain it to case of necessity.

Cyprian, one of the antientest Writers amongst the Latines, handles it at large, in *Epist. 56. Ad Fidum*, upon this occasion, *Fidus* denyed not the baptism of Infants, but denyed that they ought to be baptized before the eighth day; *Cyprian* assures him, that by the unanimous consent of *66.* Bishops

Biſhops gathered together in a *Councell*, Baptiſme was to be adminiſtred to *Infants*, as well as to *grown* men, and not to be reſtrained to any time; and proves it by ſuch Arguments as theſe: They are under originall ſinne, they need pardon, are capable of grace and mercy, God regards not age, &c. This teſtimony of *Cyprians* is cited and approved by *Auguſt. Epiſt.* 28. *& Lib.* 3. *de merit. & Remiſſ. pecca. cap.* 5. *& lib.* 3. *contra Pelag.* and by *Hierom contra Pelag. lib.* 3. Of the ſame judgement was *Ambroſe, lib.* 2. *cap.* 11. *De Abraham Patriarcha*, and many others of the ancients, which I relate not to *prove* the *truth* of the thing, but onely the *practiſe* of it: and indeed, although ſome in thoſe times queſtioned it, as *Auguſt.* grants in his Sermon, *De Verbis Apoſtol.* yet the firſt that ever made a head againſt it, or a diviſion in the Church about it, was *Baltazar Pacommitanus* in *Germany* in *Luthers* time, about the year 1527. and ſince that time multitudes in *Germany* have imbraced his opinion, who becauſe they oppoſed *Pædo-Baptiſme*, were forced to reiterate their own Baptiſme, and thence were called *Anabaptiſts*, and ſoon proved a dangerous and turbulent Sect againſt the Reformation; not onely working a world of miſchiefe about *Munſter* and other parts of *Germany*, but have with this opinion, drunk in abundance of other dangerous Hereſies and Blaſphemies, and quickly grew into ſuch diviſions, and ſub-diviſions among themſelves, that *Bullenger* notes that they were grown to no leſſe then fourteen ſeverall Sects in his time: Which in truth is the common lot of all Sectaries; who when once they have departed from the Church, upon every ſmall occaſion they come to bee divided again among themſelves, and one from another: As the Eccleſiaſticall Story lets us ſee in the *Novatians, Macedonians, Ennomians, Arrians, &c.* which diviſions alſo opened a way to their totall deſtruction in the end: their mutuall bickerings among themſelves, being as the beating

When the Sect of the Anabaptiſts began.

Niceph. 1235.

Niceph. 1230.

of the waves of the Sea, one againſt another, till all were changed, as the Hiſtorian notes of them. And becauſe this Opinion, and divers others which depend upon it, begins unhappily to take place and ſpread among our ſelves in this Kingdom; and ſo the work of Reformation (without Gods mercy) likely to be much hindred by it; I ſhall (God willing) handle this Queſtion more largely, then I have done any other in this place; and the rather becauſe of three other great miſchiefes which go along with it.

nd the dan-
er of their o-
inions.

Firſt, I ſee that all who reject the Baptizing of Infants, do and muſt upon the ſame ground reject the Religious obſervation of the Lords day, or the Chriſtian Sabbath, *viz.* becauſe *there is not* (ſay they) *an expreſſe inſtitution or command* in the New Teſtament. Verily, I have hardly either known, or read, or heard of any one who hath rejected this of Infants, but with it they reject that of the Lords day: now God hath ſo bleſſed the religious obſervation of the Lords day in this Kingdom above other Churches and Kingdoms, that ſuch as indevour to overthrow it, deſerve juſtly to be abhorred by us.

Secondly, the teachers of this Opinion, where-ever they prevaile, take their Proſelytes wholly off from the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, and all other acts of Chriſtian communion, both publick and private; from any, but thoſe who are of their own opinion, condemning them all as limbs of Antichriſt, worſhippers, and followers of the Beaſt: And ſo not only labour to caſt the godly Miniſters out of the hearts of thoſe people whom they have wonne to Chriſt, but leave the people whom they inſnare without any hope of recovery, whileſt they impoſe upon their conſciences, to hear none but ſuch as may confirme them in their errours; An old trick of *Satan*, which hee taught the Papiſts long agone, a meere politick device to keep their Diſciples faſt unto themſelves: which unchriſtian courſe, how

how prosperous soever it may seem to be at the first, cannot be blessed by God, nor indeed is it, the Lord giving them up almost every where, to other most dangerous, vile, and abominable opinions. I deny not but some few who are of this opinion are otherwise minded, but all our experience teacheth us that the generality of them do runne this way.

Thirdly, this opinion puts all the Infants of *all Beleevers* into the self-same condition with the Infants of *Turks*, and *Indians*, which they all readily acknowledge; and from thence, unavoidably one of these three things must follow. 1. Either all of them are damned who die in their Infancy, being without the Covenant of Grace, having no part in Christ. Or, 2. All of them saved, as having no originall sinne, and consequently needing no Saviour; which most of the Anabaptists in the world doe own, and therewith bring in all *Pelagianism, Universall grace, Free-will, &c.* Or, 3. That although they bee tainted with Originall corruption, and so need a Saviour, Christ doth *pro beneplacito*, save *some* of the Infants of *Indians and Turkes*, dying in their Infancy, as well as *some* of the Infants of *Christians*; and so carry salvation by Christ out of the Church, beyond the Covenant of Grace, where God never made any promise: That God hath made a promise to bee the God of *Beleevers*, and of *their Seed*, we all know; but where the promise is to be found, that he will be the God of the seed of such Parents who live and die his enemies, and their seed, not so much as called by the preaching of the Gospel, I know not. These men say the Covenant of Grace made to the *Jews*, differs from the Covenant of Grace made with *us*; but I desire to know whether in the *one*, or in the *other*, they find any promise of salvation by Christ to any Infants dying in their Infancy, whose Parents no way belonged to the Family of God, or Covenant of Grace.

The matter then being of such consequence, and many amongst us in such danger of being seduced, further then is easie to imagine, through the subtilty, activity, and diligence of such as with a great shew of Scriptures, and under a pretence of zeale, doe creep into Houses; yea, proclaim these things openly in Pulpits: I take my self bound upon this occasion to shew you upon what grounds the Orthodox Church hath hitherto retained this practise, and shall bring all that I intend to speak of it under two arguments, and under them shall indevour to answer whatsoever I have found of any moment objected to the contrary.

First Argument they are under the Covenant of grace, and therefore must have the seale of the Covenant,

My first Argument is this, *The infants of beleeving Parents are* fœderati, *therefore they must bee* signati; *they are within the Covenant of grace, belonging to Christs body, kingdom, family; therefore are to partake of the seale of his Covenant, or the distinguishing badge between them who are under the Covenant of grace, and them who are not.*

The ordinary Answer to this Argument is, by denying that Infants are under the Covenant of Grace; only some few deny the consequence, that although they were within the Covenant, yet it follows not that they must bee sealed, because (say they) the *Women* among the Jewes were under the Covenant, yet received not Circumcision, which was the seale of the Covenant; but this receives an easie answer, the Women were Circumcised in the Males, else could not God have said, that the whole house of *Israel* were Circumcised in the flesh, else could not the whole Nation of the Jewes bee called *the Circumcision*, in opposition to all the world beside, who were called *the Uncircumcision.*

This Argument made good by five Conclusions,

But for the better clearing of this whole Argument; I shall indevour to make good these five Conclusions.

First, that the Covenant of Grace hath alwayes, for substance, been one and the same.

Second-

Secondly, God will have the Infants of such as enter into Covenant with him, bee counted his, as well as their Parents.

Thirdly, God hath ever since *Abrahams* time, had a Seale to bee applyed to such as enter into Covenant with him.

Fourthly, by Gods own order, the Seed, or Infants of Covenanters before Christs time, were to bee sealed with the seale of admission into his Covenant, as well as their Parents.

Fifthly, the priviledge of such as are in Covenant since Christs time, are as honourable, large, and comfortable, both to themselves and their children, as they were before Christs time: and these five Propositions made good, the Argument will bee strong and undeniable.

1 *Conclusion.* The Covenant of grace alwayes the same for substance.

The first is, *That the Covenant of Grace, for substance, hath alwayes been one and the same, both to the Jewes and to the Gentiles.* Which to understand, know, that the new and living way to life was first revealed to *Adam*, immediately after his fall, and that blessed promise concerning the Seed of the woman was often renewed, and the Patriarchs faith *therein*, and salvation *thereby*, recorded plentifully in the Scripture: but the first time that ever it was revealed under the expresse name of a League or Covenant was with *Abraham*; and therefore wee shall need look no higher then his dayes: who becaus he was the first explicite Covenanter, is called the father of the faithfull; and ever since clearly hath all the World been divided into two distinct bodies, or families; the one called the Kingdome, City, Houshold of God, to which all who own the way to life, were to joyn themselves; and these were called the *Children of God*, the *Sons of Abraham*, the *Children of the Kingdom*: All the rest of the World, the kingdom of the *Devil*, the *Seed of the Serpent*, *Strangers from the Covenant of Grace*, *without God*

in

herein lies
substance
the Cove-
nt.

n.17.1.&c.
l.3 15.
om. 4.3.
h.8.56.

al.3.6.
en.17,1.
en.18.19.
l.3.17.19.

hough not
e same for
anner of ad-
inistration.

in the world, &c. Now, I say that this Covenant of Grace hath for substance been alwayes the same; for substance I say, for we must distinguish betwixt the Covenant it self, and the manner of administration of this Covenant: The *substance* of the Covenant on Gods part was, to bee *Abrahams God*, and *the God of his seed*, to bee an *Al-sufficient portion*, an *Al-sufficient reward for him*, to give *Jesus Christ* to him, and *Righteousnesse with him*, both of *Justification* and of *Sanctification*, and *everlasting life*. On *Abrahams* part the *substance* of the Covenant was, to *beleeve* in the promised Messiah, to walk before God with a perfect heart, to *serve* God according to his revealed wil, to *instruct* his family, &c. The *manner* of administration of this Covenant at the first, was by *types*, and *shadows*, *sacrifices*, *&c.* And foure hundred and thirty years after, the Law was added with great terrour upon Mount *Sinai*, not as a part of this Covenant, but as the Apostle saith expresly, it was added because of *Transgressions*, to bee a Schoolemaster to whip to Christ: Plainly in that giving of the Law, there was something of the Covenant of works made with *Adam* in Paradise; yet in order to the Administration of the Covenant of grace, there was a *rehearsall* of the Covenant of workes, under which all men lie by nature, untill they be brought under the Covenant of Grace: and this was delivered with great terrour, and under most dreadfull penalties, that they who were prone to seek justification in *themselves*, by finding the τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, the impossibility of their keeping the Law, might be driven to seek for a better Mediator, even the Lord Jesus Christ, as was excellently shadowed out, *Exod.* 20. 18,19,20. *Deut.* 5. 24. when they cryed out to *Moses, that they might no more heare this dreadfull voyce*, which would kill them, but that they might be spoken unto by a Mediator: and God said, they *had well spoken*, and presently accepted *Moses* for their *typicall* mediator, and by him

gave

gave them the Gospel in their *Tabernacle Ordinances*. And there was also something of the *administration* of the *Covenant of grace*; partly, because all the threatning and cursing part of it was intended as a preparative and means to fit them for Christ; and partly, because the directing part of it containes that *very rule* whereby *Abraham*, and all his *seed* were ordered to walk in obedience towards God.

To conclude this, all their externall promises in case of obedience, all outward blessings which were to bee enjoyed by them, the Land of *Canaan*, and all the good things in it, all outward punishments and threatnings, losse of their Countrey, going into captivity, all their Sacrifices, their Washings, their Sprinklings, their holy persons, holy Feasts, and holy things, were all of them but so many Administrations of the Covenant of Grace: Earthly things *then*, were not only promised or threatned more distinctly and fully, then now they are to them who are in Covenant, but were figures, signes, types, and Sacraments of spirituall things, to bee injoyed both by them and by us; as might bee cleared by abundance of particulars: Take but that one instance of the Land of *Canaan*, which albeit in it self it was but like other Lands, yet was it by the Lord sanctifyed to spirituall ends, where hee would have his Tabernacle pitched, and Temple built, out of which land, when the ten Tribes were carried captive, hee is said to have put them out of his sight: the very Land being figuratively holy, and a signe of Gods presence, the resting of Gods people there, a signe of their eternall rest in Heaven, into which not *Moses* the Law-giver, but *Joshua*, or *Jesus*, the type of their true Jesus, was to bring them: neither did the Lord promise them entrance into, or continuance in that Land, but upon the same conditions upon which hee promiseth eternall life, as true Faith in the Gospel, with the love and feare of God, and obedience of his Commandements:

2 King. 17. 18.

Heb. 3. 11. 4. 5. 8.

Heb. 3. 17, 18, 19. with 4. 2.

Library of the UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY New York

Godlineſſe having then, as it hath now and alwayes, the promiſe of good things for this life, and the life to come, of earthly things, then more diſtinctly and fully, and typically, but of heavenly things more generally and ſparingly; whereas now on the contrary, there is a more cleare and full revelation and promiſe of heavenly things, but the promiſe of things earthly, more generall and ſparing: Now this externall *Adminiſtration* of the Covenant, is not the *ſame* with *us*, as it was with *them*, but the Covenant is the ſame; they were under the ſame *miſery by Nature*, had the *ſame Chriſt*, the Lambe ſlaine from the beginning of the World, the ſame *conditions* of *Faith and Repentance*, to bee made partakers of the Covenant, had the ſame *graces* promiſed in the Covenant, Circumciſing of their heart, to love the Lord, &c. Theirs was diſpenſed in darker Prophecies, and obſcurer Sacrifices, types, and Sacraments, ours more *gloriouſly* and *clearely*, and in a greater meaſure: the cloathes indeed doe differ; but the body is the ſame in both.

vit. 20.2.&c. .36. ut. 10.12. with 11.1. 9,22.&c. Cor. 10.5.6?

As is apparent, if, firſt, you look but into the Prophecies that were made, *Jer.* 31. 33. *Iſai.* 59. 21. *Joel* 2. 52. and many other places, where the ſame things are promiſed to the Gentiles, when the Goſpel ſhould bee preached unto them which were firſt promiſed to *Abraham*, and to his ſeed; but more fully, if you look into the New Teſtament, where you ſhall finde, *Luk.* 1·54,55, 69,70, 72,73. *Luk.* 2.31.32. that Chriſt, and the Kingdom of grace by him, is acknowledged to bee the ſumme of the Oath and Covenant, which God had promiſed to *Abraham*, and to his *ſeed*: So *Matth.* 21.41.43. the ſame Vineyard that was let to the Jews, ſhould afterward bee let to the Gentiles: the ſame Kingdom of God which was formerly given to the Jewes, ſhould bee taken from them, and given to the Gentiles: So *Rom.* 11. the Gentiles were to bee ingraffed into the ſame

The identity of the Covenant to Jews and Gentiles proved.

er. 31.33. ſa. 59.21. oel 2.32. uk. 1.54.&c.

ſtock

ſtock *in* which formerly the *Jewes* had grown, and from which they were now to bee cut off, and *into* which in the end they ſhould bee ingraffed again: So *Gal.* 3. 8. 14. 16. *Abraham* had the ſame Goſpel preached to him, which is now preached to us, the ſame bleſſing beſtowed upon *Abraham*, comes on the Gentiles through Jeſus Chriſt, that they (as well as he) *might receive the promiſe of the Spirit through Faith*; they who receive the promiſe of the Spirit through Faith, have the bleſſing of *Abraham* come upon them: as cleare is that, *Epheſ.* 2.13. to the end of the chapter, the partition wall which ſevered us from the *Jewes*, is now broken down, and the Gentiles who formerly were afarre off, are now taken in, and made Inter-Commoners with the *Jewes*: the Apoſtle alluding to the manner of the Jewiſh worſhip, where beyond the Court wherein the *Jews* did worſhip, there was another Court divided from it by a ſept or wall, which was called, *Atrium gentium & immundorum*, the Court of the *Gentiles* and of the unclean, nearer then which none of them might approach unto the Temple; but now, ſaith hee, *The partition wall is broken down, and wee are no more ſtrangers and Forainers; but made fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the houſhold of God: and with them grow up into an holy Temple in the Lord*; all which ſhews that the very ſelfe-ſame priviledges formerly made peculiar to the Jews, are now through Chriſt communicated to the Gentiles. And this will yet more fully appeare, if wee conſider how St. *Paul* to the *Galatians*, ſhewes that the *ſame ſeed* of *Abraham*, ſo much ſpoken of in the Covenant made with him, is now found among the Gentiles, as it was formerly among the Jews; there you ſhall finde *three ſorts* of *Abrahams* ſeed: Firſt, *Chriſt*, *Gal.* 3. 16. the root and ſtock, the head, and elder brother of all the reſt. Secondly, all *true beleevers* are *Abrahams ſeed*, *cap.* 3. 29. theſe onely are made partakers of the *ſpirituall* part of the Covenant.

Luk. 2. 31. Mar. 21. 41. Rom. 11. Gal. 3. 8. 14. Eph. 2. 13.

Thirdly, you shall finde another seed of *Abraham*, who were only circumcised in the *flesh*, and not in the *heart*, who though they were either *born* of *Abrahams* seed, or *professed Abrahams* faith, and so were Jewes *facti*, though not *nati*, *made*, though not *born Jewes*, becomming Proselytes, never came to make *Abrahams* God their All-sufficient portion, but placed their happinesse in somewhat, which was not *Christ*, either by *seeking justification by the workes of the Law, being ignorant of Gods righteousnesse, and going about to establish their own righteousnesse did not submit themselves unto the righteousnesse of God*, or placed their happinesse, *in satisfying the lusts of the flesh*, going a whoring after the Creature; and so though they were *Abrahams* seed by *profession* and *outward cleaving* to the Covenant, yet were to bee cast off with the rest of the uncircumcised, of whom *Ishmael* and *Esau* were types, *Gal.* 4. 22. *&c. Even so it is now* in the times of the Gospel, we have now Jesus Christ, the Elder brother, the first-borne of the Covenant, wee have also *true beleevers*, who are brethren and Co-heires with him, who are properly the heires by promise, and wee have also some who are onely a holy seed by *externall profession*, *Gal.* 4. 29. who either with the false teachers, which *Paul* there speaks of, mingle *justification by the Law and Gospel together*, or with others, 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. though they have *a forme of godlinesse, yet deny the power of it in their lives and conversations*. So much for the first Conclusion, that the Covenant of grace, for substance, was alwayes one and the same.

Rom. 10. 3.

2 *Conclusion.* Infants taken into Covenant with their Parents.

Ever since God gathered a distinct, select number out of the world, to bee his Kingdom, City, House-hold, in opposition to the rest in the world, which is the kingdom, city, house-hold of Satan, hee would have *The Infants of all who are taken into Covenant with him, to bee accounted his, to belong to him, to his Church and Family, and not to the Devils*. As it is in *other* Kingdoms, Corporations, and Families, the children

dren of all Subjects born in a Kingdome, are born that Princes Subjects; where the Father is a *Free-man*, the childe is not born a *ſlave*; where any are *bought* to bee *ſervants*, their children born in their Maſters houſe, are born his *ſervants*. Thus it is by the Laws of almoſt all Nations, and thus hath the Lord ordained it ſhall bee in his Kingdom and Family; the *children* follow the Covenant-condition of their *Parents*, if hee take a Father into Covenant, hee takes the children in with him; if hee reject the Parents out of Covenant, the children are caſt out with them; Thus without all queſtion it was in the time of the Jews, *Gen.* 17.9. *&c.* and when any of any other Nation, though a *Canaanite* or *Hittite*, acknowledged *Abrahams* God to bee their God, *they* and their *children* came into covenant together. Hoſea. 2. 2. Exod. 12. 48, 49.

And ſo it continues *ſtill*, though the Anabaptiſts boldly deny it: *Act.* 2. 38, 39. when *Peter* exhorted his hearers, who were pricked in their hearts, to repent and bee baptized for the remiſſion of ſins, hee uſeth an argument to perſwade them, taken from the benefit which ſhould *come to their poſterity*; for *the Promiſe* (ſaith hee) *is unto you and unto your children, and to all that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*: if once they obey the call of God, as *Abraham* did, the promiſe was made to *them and to their children*, whether they who obey this call were the *preſent* Jews to whom hee ſpake, or were *afar off*: whether by *afarre off*, you will mean the *Gentiles*, who as yet *worſhipped afar off*; or the Jews, or any who as yet were *unborn*, and ſo were afarre off in *time*, or whether they dwelt in the remoteſt parts of the world, and ſo were afarre off in *place*, the Argument holds good to the end of the world, Repent and be baptized for the remiſſion of ſins, and yee ſhall receive the Holy Ghoſt; *For the Promiſe is made to you and to your children*, they ſhall bee made free of Gods City, according to *Abrahams* Copy; *I will bee thy God, and the God of thy ſeed.* Let Act. 2. 38, 39. opened and cleared.

Zacheus the Publican once receive Christ *himself*, bee hee a *Gentile*, as some think hee was; bee hee a *great sinner*, esteemed as a heathen, as we all know hee was, let him professe the faith of Christ, and the Covenant of salvation comes to his *house*; for now hee is made a *sonne of Abraham*: that is, *Abrahams promise now reacheth him.*

Luke 19.

Object. Neither can the evidence of this place bee eluded by saying, the promise here meant, is of the *extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, to speak with tongues, &c.* For wee all know that *all* who then beleeved and were baptized, did not receive *those extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost*; and beside; this Argument remains still in force to bee used to the *end* of the World, *Who ever beleeves and is baptized, shall receive remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost*: Which was not true, if by the Holy Ghost was meant *only* those *extraordinary gifts.*

Answ.

Object. Nor, secondly, can it bee avoided by that shift of others who interpret it thus; *To you and your children, as many of them as the Lord shall call*: that is, (say they) whether *your selves*, or your *children*, or any other whom the Lord *shall call*, if they repent and bee baptized, they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for it is plaine, that the strength of this Argument lieth in this, That if they did repent and were baptized, the promise should bee made good to *them*, and to their *children*, and what comfortable argument can this bee taken from respect to their *children*, if the Apostle must be interpreted as these men would have him? *viz. You and your Children have hitherto been an holy seed, but now if you beleeve in Christ your selves, your children shall be in no better condition then the rest of the Pagan world, strangers from the Covenant of God; but if afterward any of them, or any of the Heathen shall for their parts beleeve and be baptized, their particular persons shall bee took into Covenant, but their children still left out*: had this think you been a comfor-

Answ.

table

table Argument to perſwade them to come in, in relation to the good of their children after them? The plaine ſtrength of the argument is, *God hath now remembred his Covenant to Abraham, in ſending that bleſſed ſeed, in whom hee promiſed to bee the God of him and his ſeed; do not you by your unbeliefe, deprive your ſelves, and your poſterity of ſo excellent a gift.* And except in relation to the Covenant, there was no occaſion to name their *children*, it had been ſufficient to have ſaid, a promiſe is made to *as many as the Lord ſhall call.*

As plain it is out of the 11 of the *Rom. 16. &c.* where the Apoſtles ſcope is to ſhew that wee Gentiles have now the *ſame* graffing into the true Olive which the Jewes formerly had, and our *preſent graffing in*, is anſwerable to their *preſent caſting out*, and their *taking in* in the latter end of the World, ſhall bee the *ſame graffing in* (though more gloriouſly) as *ours is now*: Now all know that when they were taken in, *they* and their *Children* were taken in, when they were broken off, *they* and their *children* were broken off, when they ſhall bee taken in, in the latter end of the world, *they* and their *children* ſhall bee taken in, and that becauſe *the roote is holy*, that is, *Gods Covenant with Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, extends yet unto them when their unbeliefe ſhall bee taken away.* The roote being like *Nebuchadnezzars* tree, the tree hewen down, and the roote bound with a band of iron untill ſeven times were paſſed over it, and then the bands ſhould be broken, and the roote ſhould ſpring, and the tree ſhould grow again: So their preſent Nation *like this tree*, is cut down, and this *holy roote* the Covenant made with their forefathers, is *ſuſpended*, bound with an iron barre of *unbeleefe, blindneſſe being come upon them, untill the fulneſſe of the Gentiles bee come in, and then all Iſrael ſhall bee ſaved.* And mark that in all this diſcourſe, the holineſſe of the branches there ſpoken of, is not meant of a perſo-

Rom 11.16. opened.

perſonall inherent holineſſe, but a *derivative* holineſſe, a holineſſe *derived* to them from their *Anceſtors*; *The firſt fruite is holy, the lumpe holy, the roote holy, the branches holy*, that is, *the Fathers holy accepted in Covenant with God, the children beloved for their fathers ſake*; and when the vaile of unbeliefe ſhall bee taken away, the children and their poſterity ſhall be taken in again, *becauſe beloved for their Fathers ſakes*. Now then if *our* graffing in, bee anſwerable to *theirs* in all, or any of theſe three particulars, wee and our children are graffed in together.

Ob. But here is no mention made of *our Infants graffing in*.

Anſw. Wee muſt not teach the Lord to ſpeak, but with reverence ſearch out his meaning, there is no mention made of caſting out the *Jewiſh Infants*, neither here nor *elſewhere*: when hee ſpeaks of taking away the Kingdome of God from them, and giving it to the *Gentiles* who would bring forth fruite, no mention of the *Infants* of the *one*, or of the *other*, but the one and the other for theſe outward diſpenſations, are comprehended in their parents, *as the branches in the roote*, the *Infants of the godly in their parents*, according to the tenor of his mercy, the infants of the wicked in their Parents, according to the tenor of his juſtice.

1 Cor. 7. 14. pened and indicated.

And yet plainer, (if plainer may bee) is that ſpeech of the Apoſtle, in 1 *Corinth.* 7. 14. *The unbeleeving husband is ſanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is ſanctified by the husband, elſe were your children uncleane, but now they are holy*; the plaine ſcope and meaning whereof is this; the beleeving *Corinthians*, among other caſes of conſcience which they had ſent to the Apoſtle for his reſolution of, had written this for one, whether it were lawfull for them who were converted, ſtill to retaine their Infidell wives, or husbands: their doubt ſeemes to arile from the *Law of God*, which was in force to the Nation of the Jewes; God had not onely forbidden ſuch marriages to his people, but

in

in *Ezra's* time, they put away not onely their wives, but all the children that were borne of them, as not belonging to the Common-wealth of Israel; and it was done according to the *Law*, and that Law was not a particular Edict which they did agree upon, but according to the standing Law of *Moses*, which that word there used signifieth; and in *Nehemiahs* time, the children who were borne of such marriages, were accounted a Mungrell kind, whom *Nehemiah* cursed. Now hereupon these Corinthians doubted whether their children, as well as their wives, were not to be accounted *uncleane*, and so to be put away according to those examples; to which the Apostle answers, No, *they were not to be put away*: Upon what speciall reason soever, that Law was in force to the *Jewes*, *beleeving Christians* were not in that condition, the unbeleeving wife was sanctified in the beleeving husband, *quoad hoc*, so farre, as to bring forth an *holy seed*; were it with them as when *both of them* were *unbeleevers*, so that neither of them had a prerogative to intitle their children to the Covenant of grace, their children would be an unclean Progeny; *or* were the children to be reckoned in the condition of the *worser* parent, so that the *unbeleever* could contribute more to *Paganisme*, then the *beleever* to *Christianity*; it were so likewise: but the case is otherwise, the beleeving husband hath by Gods ordinance a sanctified use of his unbeleeving *wife*, *so* as by Gods speciall promise made to beleevers and their *Seed*, they were invested, in, and to the *most spirituall end* of marriage, the *continuance of a holy seed*, wherein the Church is to be propagated to the worlds end; and the case is *here* in relation to the posterity for *spirituall* priviledges, as in *other* marriages, for *civill* priviledges, as suppose a *Prince*, or *Nobleman* marry with a woman of *base* or *meane* birth, though in *generall* it be true, that the children of those that be *base*, are born *base*, as well as the children of *Nobles* are borne

Ezra. 10. 4

תורת

Nehem. 13. 1 &c.

Mal. 2. 5.

Noble, yet here the issue hath *honour* from the *Father*, and is not accounted *base* by the baseness of the *Mother*. This I take to be the plaine meaning of the Apostles answer: But because the *Anabaptists* do very much endeavour to weaken the evidence of this Argument, I shall indeavour to cleare it from their acceptions. They utterly deny that this place is meant of any *Fœderall holinesse*, but of *legitimation*, which they call civill holinesse, and so interpret the *Corinthians* doubt to be, *whether their marriage with Unbeleevers were not now a nullity*, and their children thereupon to bee *spurious*, illegitimate, or Bastards, and the Apostles answer to be, that *because the Unbeleeving wife is sanctified to the beleeving husband*, that is, *their marriage remaines lawfull*, therefore their children are not spurious, but lawfully begotten. But that *this* cannot be the meaning, I clearly prove by these four Arguments.

1. *Argument* Because uncleanesse and holinesse no where taken for civilly lawfull.

First, uncleannesse and holinesse, when opposed one to the other, are never taken for *civilly* lawfull or unlawfull; *uncleannesse* indeed, when opposed to *cleannesse*, may be taken in severall senses, an uncleane vessell, an uncleane cloth, an uncleane garment; when opposed to *cleane*, may signifie nothing but *dirty* or *spotted*: but when uncleannes is opposed to *holinesse*, it is alwayes taken in a *sacred* sense, referring to a *Tabernacle use*, to a right of admission into, or use in, the Tabernacle or Temple, which were types to us of the visible Church: and *holinesse* is alwaies taken for a *separation of persons or things from common to sacred uses*: Even the *meats and drinkes of beleevers sanctified* to them, serve for a *religious end and use*, even to refresh them, who are the Temples of the holy Ghost; so that they have not onely a lawfull but an *holy* use of their meat and drinke, which *Unbeleevers* have *not*, to whom yet their meat and drinke is *civilly lawfull*.

1 Tim. 4. 5.

And

And whereas ſome ſay, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 3,4,5. that *chaſtity* a morall vertue found among Heathens, is called by the name of *Sanctification. Let every one poſſeſſe his veſſell, not in the luſt of concupiſcence, but in Sanctification and honour.* *Object.*

I Anſwer, *Chaſtity* among *Heathens,* is never cald *Sanctification,* but among *beleevers* it may well bee called *ſo,* being a part of the New creation, a branch of their ſanctification, wrought by the Spirit of God, a part of the inward adorning of the Temple of the holy Ghoſt. So that the meaning cannot be, your children are holy, that is, now they are *not baſtards*; but rather, whereas *before*, both *you* and *they* were *uncleane*, and might have nothing to doe with the *Temple* of God, *now* both *you* and *your children* are a *holy ſeed*, according as was ſhewed to *Peter* in his viſion, where God ſhewed him, that the *Gentiles formerly no better then uncleane beaſts, and creeping things, ſhould upon their converſion to Chriſt bee no longer eſteemed common or defiled.* *Anſw.*

Secondly, this being ſo, had *this* been the meaning, *elſe were your Children unclean*, but now they are *holy*; *elſe* had your children been *Baſtards*, but now they are *legitimate*; the Apoſtles anſwer had not been *true*, becauſe then if one of the Parents had not been a Beleever, and ſo by his being a beleever, ſanctified his unbeleeving Wife, their children muſt have been Baſtards: whereas wee know their children had been legitimate, being borne in lawfull Wedlocke, though *neither* of the Parents had been a beleever: Marriage being a *ſecond Table* duty, is *lawfull* (though not ſanctified) to Pagans as well as to Chriſtians, and the legitimation or illegitimation of the iſſue depend not upon the *Faith*, but upon the *marriage* of the Parents; let the marriage be lawfull, and the iſſue is legitimate, whether *one*, or *both*, or *neither* of the Parents be beleevers or infidels: take but away lawfull marriage, betwixt the Man and the Wo- 2. *Argumen* The Apoſtle anſwer had n contained a truth.

man, and the issue is illegitimate, whether one or both, or neither of the Parents are beleevers or infidels: withall, if the children of *Heathens* be Bastards, and the marriage of Heathens no marriage, then there is no adultery among heathens, and so the seventh Commandement is altogether in vaine in the words of it as to them.

1. *Argument.* For had the Apostles argument had any reason in it, if interpreted as they would have it.

Besides St. *Pauls* reason had no *strength* in it, supposing the Text were to be interpreted as these men would have it; Their doubt (say they) was, that their marriage was an unlawfull wedlocke, and so consequently their children Bastards; now mark what kinde of answer they make the Apostle give, *Were yee not lawfull man and wife, your children were Bastards, but because the unbeleeving wife is sanctified in the husband, &c. because your marriage is a lawfull marriage, your children are legitimate.* What strength of reason is in this? if this had been their doubt or question, whether then marriage were not a nullity, the Apostle *by his Apostolick authority* might have *definitively* answered, *without giving a reason, your marriage is good,* and *your children legitimate*; but if *Paul* will go about to satisfie them by reason, & prove them to be mistaken, it behoved him to give such a reason which should have some weight in it, but this hath none; let their doubt (as these men frame it) and the Apostles answer (as these men interpret him) together, and you will easily see the invalidity of it; *We doubt,* say the Corinthians, *we are not lawfull man and wife, and that therefore our children are Bastards. No,* saith Paul, *you are mistaken, and I prove it* thus, *Were yee not lawfull man and wife, your children were bastards; but because yee are lawfull man and wife, your children are not bastards.* Is there any argument or proofe in this?

2. *Argument.* Nor could have satisfied their doubt.

Fourthly, according to *this* their interpretation, the Apostles answer could no wayes have reached to the quieting of their *consciences*; their doubt was, whether according

to

to the example in *Ezra*, they were not to put away their wives and children, as *not belonging to God*, as being a Seed whom God would not own among his people; now what kind of quiet would this have given them, to tell them that their children were not Baſtards? We know the *Jews* did not *put away* their Baſtards, as not belonging to the Covenant of God; *Phares*, and *Zarah*, and *Jepthah*, and innumerable others, though *baſtards*, were *circumciſed*, and not cut off from the people of God.

And whereas ſome object out of *Deut.* 23.2. that baſtards did not belong to the Covenant among the *Jews*, becauſe *God there forbad a baſtard to come into the Congregation of the Lord.*

I Anſwer, that is meant *onely* of *bearing Office* in the Church, or ſome ſuch like thing, and not of being under the Covenant, belonging to the Church: as is manifeſt, not onely by what hath been *now* ſaid of *Jepthah* and others, who were *circumciſed*, and *offered ſacrifices*, and *drew nigh to God* as well as any other; but the very text alledged gives ſufficient light, that it cannot be meant otherwayes; becauſe in that place, *who ever is an Eunuch, or wounded in his ſtones*, hath the *ſame* excluſion from the congregation of the Lord: and I hope no man will dare to ſay, that *none ſuch are holy to the Lord*; if they ſhould, the Scripture is full enough againſt them: that putting away of *Ezra* was of an higher nature then bare illegitimation; and therefore it behooved the Apoſtle to give another manner of ſatisfaction to their doubtfull conſciences, then to tell them their children were not Baſtards: Therefore I conclude, that *this holineſſe being the fruits of one of the Parents being a beleever, muſt be meant of ſome kinde of holineſſe, which is not common to the ſeed of them whoſe Parents are both Unbeleevers*, and that is enough for our purpoſe.

Deut. 23.2.

Eſa. 59.3,4. Act. 8.27.

Yet their remaines two Objections to bee anſwered, which

which are made againſt this our interpretation.

ject. Firſt, the *Unbeleeving wife*, is here ſaid to *be ſanctified*, as well as the *Child* is ſaid to *bee holy*, and the Originall word is the ſame for both, one the *verb*, the other the *noune*: if then the *child* is *holy*, with a *fœderall holineſſe*, then is alſo the *unbeleeving wife ſanctified* with a *fœderall Sanctification*, and ſo the *wife*, although remaining a heathen, may be yet counted to belong to the Covenant of grace.

Inſwer. I Anſwer; Indeed there would be weight in this objection if the Apoſtle had ſaid the *Unbeleeving* Wife is ſanctified, and no more, as he ſimply ſays, the children are *holy*; but *that* he doth not ſay, he ſaith indeed the *Unbeleeving* wife is ſanctified in the *beleeving husband*, or to the *beleeving husband*: that is, *to* his uſe, as all other creatures are, as the *bed* he lies on, the *meat* hee eats, the *cloaths* hee weares, the beaſt he rides on, are ſanctified to him, and ſo this *ſanctifiedneſſe* of the wife is not a ſanctification of *ſtate*, but onely of *uſe*, and of *this uſe* to be ſanctified *to the beleeving husband*, whereas the holines and ſanctification that is ſpoken of the children, is a holineſſe of *ſtate*, and not only a ſanctification to the parents *uſe*.

y the Greek repoſition gnifying *to* as ell as *in*, as al. 1.16.2 et. 1.5 Act. 4. a. 1 Cor. 7 14

2. Object. That holineſſe of the Children is *here* meant, which could not be, unleſſe one of the Parents were ſanctifyed to the other, which is the force of the Apoſtles arguing, the *unbeleever is ſanctified* to the *beleever*, *elſe* were not the children holy, but uncleane: but *fœderall holineſſe* of children may be where the Parents are not ſanctified, one *in* or *to* the other, as in baſtardy, *Davids* child by *Bathſheba*, *Phares* and *Zarah*, *Judahs* children by *Thamar*; the *Iſraelites* children by the Concubines, *Abrahams* ſonne *Iſhmael* by *Hagar*, &c. in which caſes the children were fœderally *holy*, and accordingly were circumciſed, and yet the Harlot not ſanctified *in* or *to* the Adulterer or Fornicator, though a beleever.

I anſwer, we muſt attend the Apoſtles ſcope, wch is to ſhew that the children would be *unholy*, if the *faith* and *beleever-ſhip* of *one* of the Parents could not remove the *barre*, which lies *in the other*, being an unbeleever, againſt the producing of an holy ſeed, *becauſe one of them was a Pagan, or unbeleever, therefore the child would not be an holy ſeed, unleſſe the faith or beleeverſhip of the other Parent could remove this bar*: Now this can have no place of an Argument, in any caſe, where *one* of the Parents is not an *Infidell*: but this was not the caſe among the Jewes; *Hagar*, and *Thamar*, and the *Concubines*, however *ſinfull* in thoſe *acts*, yet themſelves were *beleevers*, belonging to the Covenant of God, and *that barre* lay not againſt their children, as did in the *unbeleeving wife*: indeed if a *beleeving* man or woman ſhould *adulterouſly* beget a childe upon a *Pagan*, a *Heathen*, or *Unbeleever*, there this objection deſerves to bee further weighed, but here it comes not within the compaſſe of the Apoſtles Argument. *Anſw.*

Before I paſſe from this ſecond concluſion, let me further ſhew you why the Lord will have the children of beleeving Parents reckoned even in their Infancy, to belong to him. Firſt, his own *beneplacitum*, his free grace and favour which moves him to ſhew mercy to whom he will, is a ſufficient anſwer to all: But ſecondly, he will have it for *his own glory*. It is the honour of other Princes, that all who are born in their kingdome ſhould bee accounted *borne their Subjects*; and the honour of great Maſters, that the children of their ſervants born in their hoſes, ſhould be born their ſervants: *Solomon* counts it a piece of his glory, that he had ſervants born in his houſe. And on the other ſide, it is a diſhonour to a King not to be able legally to lay claim to thoſe born in his kingdome, but that another King, yea, an *enemy* might *legally* challenge them to be *his* Subjects. So is it with the Lord, he having left all the reſt of the world, to be viſibly the devils kingdome, will not for his own *glories ſake* permit

Reaſon why God will have ſuch Infants accounted his.

Eccleſ. 2. 7.

mit the Devil to come and lay visible claime to the sonnes and daughters, begotten by those who are the children of the most High. And thirdly, he doth it both for the *comfort* and *duty* of those who are in Covenant with him, partly I say, for their comfort and priviledge, while they may see their children visibly to be provided for by a better Father, under a Covenant of Grace, to whose care, and under whose wing they may leave them, when themselves shal faile; and partly to bee an obligation to bring them up *for* God, not to *themselves*, much lesse to the *devil*, but ever to look upon themselves in the education of their children, to be but *nursing Fathers and Mothers, to train them up in the nurture and feare of the Lord*, unto whose kingdom, family, and Covenant they thus belong.

I have been the larger upon these two first conclusions, because indeed the proving of *these*, gains the *whole cause*, if the Covenant be the same, and children belong to it, then they are to be owned as *Covenanters*, and to be admitted to the distinguishing or discriminating sign betwixt Gods people and the devils; and this the most learned of the Anabaptists doe professe, that if they knew a Child to be holy, they would baptize it. In the other Conclusions I shall be more briefe.

3. *Conclusion* The Lord hath appointed and ordained a Sacrament or *seale of initation to be administred unto them who enter into Covenant with him, Circumcision* for the time of that administration which was *before* Christs incarnation, *baptisme since* the time of his incarnation; both of them the *same* sacrament for the *spirituall* part, though differing in the outward Elements; *both* appointed to bee *distinguishing signes*, betwixt Gods people, and the Devils people; both of them the way and meanes of solemne entrance & admission into the Church; *both* of them to be administred but *once*, and none might be received into the *Communion* of the Church of the *Jewes*, untill

untill they were *circumciſed*, nor into the *Communion* of the Church of the Chriſtians untill they be *Baptized*; none but the circumciſed might eat of the *Paſchall* Lamb, none may but thoſe who are baptized, be admitted to eat the *Lords Supper*, which ſucceeds in the room of the Paſſeover; and this our *Lord himſelf* taught us by his own example, who was *circumciſed*, as a profeſſed member of the Church of the Jewes, and when he ſet up the new Chriſtian Church he would be initiated into *it*, by the Sacrament of *Baptiſme*.

Of this Concluſion there is no great doubt, but becauſe ſome of the Anabaptiſts doe deny the Sacrament of Baptiſme to ſucceed in the room, place, and uſe of Circumciſion, bee pleaſed to obſerve how plain the Apoſtle makes it, *Coloſſ.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. where the Apoſtles ſcope is to diſſwade the beleeving Chriſtians from the rudiments of the world, and Jewiſh Ceremonies, and obſervations upon this ground, that we *are compleat in Chriſt*, and that in him as in the head, the Church hath all perfections, and becauſe he would take them wholly off from Circumciſion, the uſe wherof ingaged them to the uſe of the reſt of Jewiſh Ceremonies, he tels them, that in *Chriſt wee are circumciſed with a Circumciſion made without hands* (a better circumciſion then the Jews was) *in putting off the body of the ſinnes of the fleſh by the circumciſion of Chriſt*. And whereas the *Jewiſh* teachers would be ready to object that the receiving of the *inward* grace of Circumciſion, did not make them ſo compleat as *Abraham* and his ſeed was, becauſe they alſo had an *outward* ſenſible ſigne whereby they might bee *farther perſwaded, comforted*, and *confirmed*; to this he anſwers *ver.* 12. That neither is this priviledge wanting to *Chriſtians* who have as excellent and expreſſe a Sacrament of it, *being buried with Chriſt in Baptiſme*, the effect whereof he there ſets down, and therefore they needed not Circumciſion,

Col. 2. 11, 12. opened.

Gal. 5. 3.

as their false teachers insinuated, thereby directly teaching that our baptisme is instead of their circumcision. And the Analogy lies between two Sacramentall types of the same substance [*regeneration*] to both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And in truth had not baptisme come in the room of *it*, the Apostle could not have pitched upon a worse instance then that of Circumcision, which was so much valued by them, and was so great and usefull a priviledge unto them: Nor had there been any reason to have here named baptism, but that he meant to shew baptism to Christians, was now in the room of circumcision to the Jews.

Conclusion. Gen.17. That *by Gods own expresse order, Infants as well as grown men, were in the time of the Jewes to bee initiated and sealed with the signe of Circumcision:* Whether Jewes by nature, or Proselytes of the Gentiles, one law was for them all, if they receive the Covenant, they and their children receive circumcision: and although, as I touched before, this signe was *actually* applyed only to the *males*, yet the *females* were *virtually* circumcised in them, as is apparent both because the whole Church of the Jews were called the Circumcision, and because by Gods *expresse* order, no uncircumcised person might eat of the Passeover, which wee are sure the women did as well as the men. And whereas some who see which way the strength of this Conclusion bendeth, do alledge, that though Circumcision was to bee applyed to their Infants, yet it was not as a seale of the *spirituall* part of the Covenant of Grace, but as a national badge, a seale of some *temporall* and earthly blessings and priviledges, as of their right to the Land of *Canaan*, *&c.* and that *Ishmael* though he was circumcised for some *temporall respects*, yet hee was not thereby brought under the Covenant of grace, which was expressly said to be made with *Abraham*, in relation to *Isaac* and his seed.

Exod.12.48.

Object.

Gen.17.18.19, 20,21.

Answ. I answer, there is nothing plainer then that the Covenant where-

whereof Circumciſion was the ſigne, was the *Covenant of Grace*; *Abraham received Circumciſion* a ſigne of the righteouſneſſe of Faith, and the *Jewes* received it not as a Nation, but as a Church, as a people ſeparated from the world, and taken into Covenant with God: It is true indeed, that Circumciſion bound them who received it, to conform to that manner of adminiſtration of the Covenant which was carryed, much, by a way of Temporall bleſſings and puniſhments, they being types of ſpirituall things; but no man can ever ſhew that any were to receive the Sacrament of Circumciſion in relation to theſe *outward things onely*, or to them *at all*, further then they were adminiſtrations of the Covenant of Grace; ſure I am, the *Proſelytes* and their children could not be circumciſed in any relation at all to the temporall bleſſings of the Land of *Canaan* as they were temporall, becauſe notwithſtanding their Circumciſion they were not capable of receiving, or purchaſing any inheritance at all in that Land; ſojourne there they might, as other ſtrangers alſo did; but the inheritance of the Land, no, not one foote of it could ever bee alienated from the ſeverall Tribes to whom it was diſtributed as their poſſeſſion by the moſt High: For all the Land was divided unto twelve Tribes, and they were not any one of them allowed to ſell their lands longer then till the year of Jubilee, *Levit.* 25. 13. &c. Yea, I may boldly ſay, that their Circumciſion was ſo farre from *ſealing* to them the outward good things of the land, that it occaſioned and tyed them to a greater expence of their temporall bleſſings by their long, and frequent, and chargeable journeys, to worſhip at *Hieruſalem*. And as for what was alledged concerning *Iſhmael*, the anſwer is eaſie; God indeed there declares that *Iſaac* ſhould be the *type of Chriſt*, and that the Covenant of Grace ſhould bee *eſtabliſhed* and continue in his family; yet both *Iſhmael* and

Rom. 4. 11.

Deut. 12. 8. Lev. 25. 13. &

the reſt of *Abrahams* Family were *really* taken into Covenant, untill afterward by Apoſtaſie they diſcovenanted themſelves, as alſo did *Eſau* afterward, though he were the Son of *Iſaac*, in whoſe family God had promiſed the Covenant ſhould continue.

Concluſion. Fifthly and laſtly, the priviledges of *beleevers under* this laſt and beſt adminiſtration of the *Covenant of grace*, are many wayes *inlarged*, made more *honorable*, and *comfortable*, then ever they were in the time of the Jews adminiſtration; *many* Scriptures ſpeake of the inlargement of their priviledges, not *one* for the *diminiſhing*, or *depreſſing*, or *extenuating* of them; that yoke, that hard and coſtly way of adminiſtration, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to beare, is taken off from our ſhoulders; our Covenant is laid to be eſtabliſhed upon *better promiſes*, the glory of *theirs* had no *glory* in reſpect of *ours*, they were under the bondage of *Infants* under age, in compariſon of our *freedom*, we as well as they are called a *holy Nation*, a *peculiar people*, a *choſen generation*, ſeparated to him from all other people, to whom, as well as to them, belongs the *adoption*, *the Covenant*, *the promiſes*; we as well as they, injoy him to be our Father, and with his deareſt Son our Lord, are made Coheires of the *Kingdom* of glory; we have all theſe things with advantage, not only in the clearneſſe of the adminiſtration, but in ſome ſenſe in greater extent to perſons with us, there is neither male nor female.

Heb. 8.6. Cor. 3.10. Gal. 4.1. &c.

Object. Some indeed goe about to ſhew, that in ſome things the Jews had greater priviledges then *wee* have, as that *Abraham* had the priviledge to be called the *Father of the Faithfull*; that *Chriſt ſhould bee born of his fleſh*, *Mary* had the priviledge to be the *Mother of Chriſt*, and the whole Nation this priviledge, *that God will call in their ſeed again*, after they had been caſt off for unbelief many hundred yeers; which priviledges, ſay they, none of the *Gentiles* have, or can have.

An-

Answer. But theſe things have no weight: We are inquiring for priviledges which are branches of the *Covenant of Grace*, which every man who is in Covenant with God, might expect from *God* by vertue of the Covenant, were he a *Jew* or a *Proſelyte*, not for any particular or *peculiar* favour to a particular *man*, or *woman*, or *family*, or *tribe*: All theſe forementioned things, and many other of the like kinde (as the *Miniſtery* of the *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, to belong to *one Tribe*, the *Kingly Office* to *one Family*; ſuch and ſuch men never to lack a man of their houſe to *ſtand before God*) proceeded indeed from *Free-grace*, but were no parts of that Covenant of grace which God made to *Abraham*, and *all* his *Seed*: For could *every* man in Covenant challenge theſe things at Gods hand, and that by vertue of the Covenant? Could every one of them promiſe to himſelfe that Chriſt ſhould be born of his fleſh? Or every one of their women that ſhe ſhould be the mother of Chriſt? Could every one whom God owned to be in Covenant with him, promiſe by vertue of the Covenant, that their children if caſt off by *unbeliefe*, ſhould after many hundred years be again called in? We ſpeak only of ſuch priviledges as *were univerſall*, and *common to all* who were in Covenant, for which by vertue of the Covenant they might relye upon God; Let any man ſhew out of the Scripture where our priviledges under the Goſpel, are cut ſhort in any of *theſe* things, and he ſaith ſomewhat; and in particular for the caſe in hand, concerning our Infants right to the Covenant of Grace, and the ſeale of it, once we are ſure the Infant *children* of all *Covenanters* were within the Covenant, and the ſeale alſo belonged to them, and by vertue of the Covenant (which is ſtill the ſame) we plead their intereſt in it. Let any man ſhew when and where this was taken away, when the Infant-children of *beleevers* were expunged out of the *Covenant* of grace; certainly whoever will goe about to de- *Anſw.*

prive them of it, to cut off such a great part of the comfort of *beleeving parents*, must produce *cleare* testimonies, before they can perswade *beleevers* to part with *either* of them, either their right to the *Covenant*, or to the *seale* of the Covenant.

For, first, their Infants interest in the *Covenant*, next to the glory of God, and the salvation of their own soules, is the greatest benefit of the Covenant of grace; even this (I say) to have their children belong to Gods Family and Kingdom, and not to the Devils: Certainly, the greatest treasure of Parents is their children, and in them the salvation of their soules: Now how uncomfortable a thing were this to Parents, to take away the very ground of their hope, for the salvation of their children? and I dare affirm it, that we have no ground of hope for any particular person, untill he be brought under the *Covenant of Grace*. All the world, as I have formerly touched, is divided into two *kingdomes*, the Kingdom of Christ, which is the Church; and the kingdom of Satan, which is the rest of the World; now so long as any person is *visibly a Member* of the *kingdom* of *Christ*, we have no cause to doubt their *election* and *salvation*, until they visibly shew the contrary, although we know that there are some *reprobate* among them; so on the other side, although we know Christ hath many of his *Elect* to be gathered out of the *Devils* kingdom, yet we have no cause or ground to hope that any particular person is any other then a *reprobate*, being a visible professed member of Satans kingdom, untill hee give hope to the contrary: now what a most uncomfortable abridgement were this of the *Covenant of Grace*, thus apparently to cut off the *Seed* of *Beleevers* from their visible right in the Church of Christ, and to put them in the visible kingdome of Satan?

And, Secondly, as really unwilling must they look to find

find Parents, to part with their childrens right to the *Seale* of the Covenant; this their right to the Covenant being all the ground of hope that *beleeving Parents* can have that their Infants who die in their Infancy, are saved, rather then the Infants of *Turkes*, *had need bee sealed*, if they live untill they are grown men, and give other signes of grace, they may conceive good hopes of them, though they were not sealed with a Sacramentall seale: This therefore is apparent, that the cutting off our priviledges & comforts in these two were a great abridgment of the priviledges of the new Covenant, and would put the *Seed* of *Abrahams* faith into a farre worse condition in regard of their posterity, then the *Seed* of his flesh were in: And the Jews in *Act.* 2. 39. if this Doctrine had been preached to them, might have replyed unto St. *Peter*, when he exhorted them to be baptized *for their childrens good*; *Nay*, *Peter*, *even therefore* we will not be baptized, for as yet we are sure our Children are in Covenant with God, and reckoned to his family; but if we receive your new way, our children must be counted to the kingdom of the Devill; and so might *they* in *Colos.* 2. when *Paul* told *them* they need not be circumcised, because Baptism came in the room of it, *they* might have replyed, that though they need not be circumcised *themselves*, yet they would still circumcise their *children*, because Baptism was not to be applyed to them according to these mens Doctrine.

Upon these five Conclusions, 1. That the Covenant of grace is always the same. 2. That the Infants of those in Covenant, are always reckoned Covenanters with their Parents. 3. That our Baptism succeeds in the room and use of their Circumcision. 4. That by Gods expresse order, their Infants were to be Circumcised, as it was a *seale* of the Covenant. And 5. that our priviledges for our selves and our Children are at least as honourable, large,

and

and comfortable as theirs were; The Concluſion follows undeniably, that therefore *the Infants of beleeving parents are to bee baptized.*

Againſt this Argument the Anabaptiſts object many things. They ſay the Covenant was not the *ſame*; ſome of them ſay, the children of the *Jewes* were not under the Covenant in relation to *ſpirituall things*: They ſay *circumciſion* and *baptiſm* ſerved not for the ſame ends and uſes: They ſay Circumciſion was adminiſtred as a Nationall badge, and properly *ſealed* temporall bleſſings. They ſay, whatever priviledges Infants of *Beleevers* had *before* Chriſts time, they have *now* none at all; and many ſuch like things: All which I have ſo fully cleared in this former Diſcourſe, that I ſuppoſe I need not adde any more; the main and only Objection remaining, which hath any colour of weight in it, is this.

Object. We want a command and example.

There is no command, no expreſſe inſtitution, or clear example in all the New Teſtament of baptizing of Infants: And in the adminiſtration of Sacraments, we are not to be led by our own reaſon, or grounds of ſeeming probability, but by the expreſſe order of Chriſt, and no other wiſe.

Anſw. Though there bee no expreſſe command or example.

If by inſtitution, command and example, they mean an *expreſſe ſyllabicall command, &c.* I grant that in ſo many words it is not found in the *New Teſtament*, no *expreſſe* command in the *New Teſtament*, that they ſhould be baptized; no *expreſſe* example where Children were baptized; but I alſo adde, that I deny the conſequence, that if *in ſo many words* it be not commanded in the New Teſtament, it ought not to be done, this is not true divinity, that Chriſtians are not tyed to obſerve that, which is not expreſly and in ſo many words ſet down in the New Teſtament; there is no expreſſe reviving of the Laws concerning the forbidden degrees of marriage in the New Teſtament, except of not having a mans fathers Wife, 1 *Cor.* 8. no expreſſe Law againſt

Which is not neceſſary.

gainſt Polygamy, no expreſſe command for the celebration of a weekly Sabbath; are therfore Chriſtians free in al theſe caſes? Yea, in the Point of *Sacraments* there is no *expreſſe command*, no *example* in all the New Teſtament, where Women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; there is no *expreſſe command* that the children of *Beleevers* when they are grown, ſhould bee *inſtructed* and baptized, though inſtructed by their Parents; expreſſe command there is, that they ſhould teach the *Heathen* and the *Jewes* and make them Diſciples, and then baptize them, but no command that the children of thoſe that are Beleevers ſhould be taught and baptized when they are grown men; nor any example where ever that was done; will any man therefore ſay, that chriſtian *women* are not to be partakers of the *Lords Supper*, nor the children of *beleevers* when *grown* men be *baptized*? I think none will be ſo abſurd as to affirm it. If it be ſaid, though theſe things be not *expreſly* and *in terminis* in the New Teſtament, yet they are there *vertually*, and by *undeniable conſequence*: I confeſſe it is true, ſo have we *vertually*, and by *undeniable conſequence* ſufficient evidence for the baptizing of children, both *commands* and *examples*; For, firſt, we have *Gods command to Abraham*, as he was the Father of all Covenanters, *that hee ſhould ſeale his children with the ſeale of the Covenant*. Now this truth all our Divines defend againſt the Papiſts, that *all* Gods commands and inſtitutions about the *Sacraments* of the *Jews*, binde *us* as much as they did *them*; in all things which belong to the *ſubſtance* of the Covenant, and were not *accidentall* unto them: *as* becauſe circumciſion is called a *ſeale of the Covenant*, therefore our Sacraments *are ſeales of the Covenant*: becauſe circumciſion might be adminiſtred but once being the *ſeale* of initiation; therefore baptiſm being alſo the ſeale of initiation, is alſo to be adminiſtred but *once*. But that circumciſion was to be adminiſtred upon the *eighth*

Yet by good conſequence we have command for it. Both in the command given to *Abraham* which reacheth us.

day onely, was an *accidentall* thing, and therefore bindes not us, the Jewish *Passeover* being to be *yearly* repeated, bindes us to have a *repetition* of the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*, which came in roome of it, because this belongs to the substance of the Covenant, both of them being Sacraments for *spirituall nourishment*, *growth* and *continuance* in the Covenant; (as the other was for birth and entrance) but that their Passeover was to be eaten in an *Evening*, and upon *one set Evening* in the yeare, was *accidentall*, and so binds not us. The like instance I give in our *Christian Sabbath*: the fourth Commandement binds *us* for the *substance* of it as much as ever it bound the *Jewes*; *There* God once for all separated one day of seven to be sacred to himselfe, and all the world stood bound in all ages to give unto God *that* one day of seven, which should be of his own choosing. Now *untill* Christs time, God chose the *last* day of the seven to be his Sabbath, and having by the *death* and *resurrection* of our Lord Jesus, put an end to the *Saturday* Sabbath, and surrogated the *first* day of the week instead thereof to be the Lords day, we need no *new* Commandment for the keeping of the *Lords day*, being tyed by the fourth Commandment to keep that day of seven which the Lord should choose, the Lord having chosen *this*, the fourth Commandment binds us to *this*, as it did the *Jews* to the *former*: so in the like manner, I say, in the Sacrament of Baptism.

When God made the Covenant with *Abraham*, and promised for his part to be the God of him and his seed, what God promised to *Abraham*, we claime our part in it, as the children of *Abraham*, and what God required on *Abrahams* part for the *substance* of *obedience*, we all stand charged with, as well as *Abraham*; wee as *Abraham* are tyed to *beleeve*, to *love* the Lord with all our heart, to have our heart circumcised, to walk before God in uprightnesse, to instruct our Children, and bring them up for God

and

and not for our ſelves, nor for the Devill, to teach them to worſhip God according to his revealed will, to train them up under the Ordinances and inſtitutions of Gods own appointment: All theſe things Gods Command to *Abraham* charges upon *all* the Children of the Covenant, though there were no *expreſſe reviving* theſe Commands in any part of the *New Teſtament*, and therefore conſequently that command of God to *Abraham* which bound *his ſeed of the Jews*, to train up their children in that manner of worſhip which was *then* in force, binds the ſeed of *Abraham*, *now* to train up their children in conformity to ſuch Ordinances as *now* are in force.

And the ſame command which injoyned *Abraham* to *ſeale* his children with the *ſeale* of the Covenant, injoynes *us* as ſtrongly to *ſeale ours* with the *ſeale* of the Covenant, and that command of God which *expreſſely* bound *Abraham* to *ſeale* his with the ſign of *Circumciſion*, which was the Sacrament *then* in force, *pro tempore*, doth *vertually* binde us to *ſeale* ours with the ſign of *Baptiſm*, which is the Sacrament *now* in force, and ſucceeds in the room of the other by his own appointment.

There is one command by *cleare* conſequence, another you ſhall finde, *Mat.* 28. where our Saviour bids them *Goe and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghoſt:* Where you have two things: Firſt, *What they were to doe*; Secondly, *To whom they were to doe it.* They were *to preach and teach all things which hee had commanded them*, that is, they were to preach the *whole Goſpel*, *Mark.* 16. 15. The whole Covenant of Grace, containing all the promiſes, whereof this is one, *viz. That God will bee the God of beleevers, and of their ſeed*, that *the ſeed of beleevers are taken into Covenant with their Parents.* This is a part of the Goſpel preached unto *Abraham*, and they were to *Baptize them*, that is, to ad-

And in Matt. 28. 19. opened and explained

miniſter baptiſm as a *Seale* of the Covenant to *all* who received the Covenant. Secondly, wee have the *perſons to whom* they were to doe this, *all Nations*, whereas before the Church was tyed to *one* Nation, *one* Nation onely were Diſciples, now their Commiſſion was extended to make *all* Nations Diſciples, every Nation which ſhould receive the *Faith*, ſhould bee to him now, as the peculiar Nation of the *Jewes* had been in time paſt. In a word, *Nations* here are oppoſed to the *one Nation* before. Now we know when that *one* Nation of the *Jewes* were made Diſciples, and circumciſed, their Infants were made Diſciples, (made to belong to Gods Schoole) and circumciſed with them, when that Nation was made Diſciples in *Abrahams* loynes, and circumciſed, their ſeed alſo was the ſame when that Nation was taken out of Egypt, and *actually* made Diſciples, their children were alſo with them, and wee know that in every Nation the *Children* make a great part of the Nation, and are alwayes included under *every* adminiſtration to the Nation, whether promiſes or threatnings, priviledges or burthens, Mercies or Judgements, unleſſe they bee excepted; ſo are they in Cities, in Families, it being the way of the Scripture, when ſpeaking *indefinitely* of a People, Nation, City, or Family, to bee either ſaved or damned, to receive mercies or puniſhments, expreſly to except *Infants* when they are to be excepted, as wee ſee in the judgement that befell *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſſe, when all that rebellious Company that came out of *Egypt*, was to periſh by Gods righteous doom, their little ones were expreſly excepted, *Numb.* 14. 31. and in the Covenant *actually* entred into by the body of the Nation, *Neh.* 10. it is expreſly limited to them who had knowledge and underſtanding. And the Diſciples who received this Commiſſion knew well, that in all Gods former adminiſtrations, when any Parents were made Diſciples, their

Numb. 14, 31.
Neh. 10, 28.

children

children were taken in with them to appertaine to the same schoole, and therefore it behoovde the Lord to give them a *caution* for the leaving out of *Infants* in his new administration, that they might know his minde, had he intended to have them left out, which that ever he did in word or deed, cannot be found in the Scriptures.

If it be said, they are not capable of being Disciples: *Object.*

I answer, even as capable as the Infants of the Jews, and Proselytes were, when they were made Disciples: and beside, they are devoted to be Disciples, being to be trained up by the *Parents*, who are from their infancy to teach them the knowledge of Christ, and at the present, they are capable of his *owne* teaching: and sure I am, in Christs own dialect, to *belong to Christ*, and to be a *Disciple* of Christ, or to bear *the name* of Christ is all one, and that such Infants doe belong to Christ, and beare the name of Christ, I have sufficiently proved already. *Answ.* Matth. 10.42 Mark. 9.41. Mat. 18.5.

And I desire it may be seriously weighed whether that expression, *Act.* 10.15. Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the *Disciples*, do not necessitate us, to give the name of *Disciples* to *Infants*, as wel as to *grown men*. for I reason thus, All they upon whose necks those false Teachers would have put the yoke of circumcision are called *Disciples*, & to be called Disciples: but they would have put the yoke of circumcision upon *Infants*, as well as *grown men*: therfore Infants as well as grown men are called Disciples and to be called so. The *major* is undeniable, the *minor* I prove thus: They who pressed circumcision to be in force, *according to the manner of Moses Law*, and would put it upon their necks *after the manner of Moses his Law*, they would put it upon Infants of those who were in Covenant with God, as well as upon the necks of those who were grown men, for so *Moses* Law required: but these false teachers pressed circumcision to be *so* in force, as is apparent, *Act.* 15.1.

Another command by good consequence for the baptizing of Infants, you shall finde in that forementioned place where the Apostle exhorted them to repent & be baptized, &c. *Because the promise was made to them and to their children*, which, as I shewed you, clearely proves that the Children of such who beleeve and are baptized, are taken into Covenant, and therefore by good consequence they also are to receive the seale of the Covenant. The Text not onely shewing that they are within the Covenant, but also that a *right* to *Baptisme* is a *consequence* of being within the Covenant. Thus for Commands: for Examples, though there should be none, there is no great argument in it, when the rule is so plain, yet we have examples enough, by good consequence, for you shall finde the Gospel took place, just as the old administration, by bringing in *whole families together*; when *Abraham* was taken in, his whole Family was taken in with him; when any of the Gentiles turned Proselytes, ordinarily their Familes came in with them: so in this new Administration, *usually* if the *Master* of the House turned Christian, his whole *family* came in and were baptized with him; The whole household of *Cornelius*, the first converted Gentile, *Act.* 11.14. the household of *Stephanus*; the household of *Aristobulus*; the household of *Narcissus*; the household of *Lydia*; the household of the *Gaoler*; these are examples not to be contemned.

9.2.38,39.

And whereas some object against this Argument, taken from whole Families, that the argument is at least as strong to prove that the Jewish Infants did eat the Passeover, because not only severall Families might, but did, and that by Gods appointment, eat the Passeover.

I Answer, by denying the conseq ence, the argument is not so strong, for the one as for the other, because no other Scripture shews that the Passeover doth belong to Infants; but we have other plain Scriptures proving that Baptisme

is

is in the room of Circumcision, which belongs therefore to Infants, as well as grown men: if any can instance of any families of *Gentiles* who were circumcised, the consequence were good, *Therefore Infants were*, if there were any Infants, because other Scriptures shew that circumcision belongs to Infants as well as grown men; but in this case the argument is not good.

So much for my first and main Argument, they are *fœderati*, and therefore must be *signati*, they are under the Covenant of Grace, and therefore are to be signed with the seale of admittance into the Covenant.

The second Argument, to whom the *inward grace* of *Baptisme* doth belong, to them *belongs the outward sign*, they ought to have the *signe*, who have the *thing signified*; the *earthly part* of the Sacrament must be granted to them who have the *heavenly part*: but the *Infants* of beleevers, even while they are Infants are made partakers of the inward Grace of Baptisme, of the heavenly and spirituall part, as well as grown men: therefore they may, and ought to receive the outward sign of Baptism. 2 Argument

The *major* Proposition, that *they who are made partakers of the inward grace, may not bee debarred of the outward sign*, is undeniable, it is *Peters* argument, *Act.* 10. *Can any man forbid water that these should not bee baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as wee?* and again, *Act.* 11. *For as much as God gave them the like gifts as hee did unto us, what was I that I could withstand God?* And this is so clear, that the most learned of the Anabaptists doe readily grant, that if they *knew* any Infants to have received the inward grace, they durst not deny them the outward sign, and that the particular Infants, whom Christ took up in his Armes and blessed, might have been baptized. And for the assumption or *minor*, *That the Infants of Beleevers, even while they are Infants, do receive the inward grace, as well as grown men*, is as plain, Acts. 10. 47. 11. 17. Mark. 10.

plaine, not only by that ſpeech of the Apoſtle, who ſaith, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *they are holy*, but our Saviour ſaith expreſſely, *Mark.* 10. Luk. 10. 14. *That to ſuch belongs the kingdom of God*, as well as to grown men: And whereas ſome would evade it, by ſaying that the Text ſaith not, *to them* belongs the Kingdom of God, but *of ſuch* is the Kingdome of Heaven, τοιούτων, of *ſuch like*, Luk. 18. 17. that is, ſuch as are graced *with ſuch like qualities*, who are *humble* and *meek*, as children are, and that *Luk.* 18. is parallell to this, in the meaning of it, *Whoſoever doth not receive the Kingdome of Heaven as a little child, hee ſhall not enter therein.*

But I anſwer, though it be true that in *other* places this is *one* uſe that Chriſt makes of an Infants age and condition, to ſhew that ſuch as receive the Kingdom of Heaven, muſt be qualifyed with humility, &c. like unto children: yet *here* it cannot be his meaning, becauſe his argument is, *ſuffer them to come to mee and forbid them not, becauſe of ſuch is the Kingdome of God*, that is, my Church and Kingdom is made up of theſe as well as of others. This was the very cauſe why the Diſciples rebuked thoſe who brought the children to Chriſt, becauſe they were *little*, not *fit to bee inſtructed*, and therefore not fit that Chriſt ſhould be troubled about them; this Chriſt rebukes in them, and tels them that the *littleneſſe* of children, is no argument why they ſhould be kept from him: *Suffer them*, ſaid he, *to come, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdome of God*: and what kinde of argument had this been, if the Text ſhould be interpreted as theſe men would have it, *Suffer little children to come unto me*, that I may *touch them, take them up in mine armes, put my hands upon them, and bleſſe them*, becauſe the Kingdom of God belongs to them, who have ſuch like qualities, who reſemble children in ſome ſelect properties? By the very ſame ground, if any had brought *doves*, and *ſheepe* to Chriſt, to *put his hands upon them, and bleſſe them*, the Diſciples had been

been liable to the *ſame reproofe*, becauſe *of ſuch* is the Kingdom of God, ſuch as are partakers of the Kingdom of God, muſt be indued with ſuch like properties.

Beſide, what one thing can be named belonging to the initiation, and being of a Chriſtian, whereof Baptiſme is a ſeale, which *Infants* are not capable of, as well as *grown men?* they are capable of receiving the *Holy Ghoſt*, of *union* with Chriſt, of *adoption*, of *forgiveneſſe* of *ſins*, of *regeneration*, of *everlaſting life*, all which things are ſignifyed and ſealed in the Sacrament of baptiſm: and it is *further* conſiderable, that in the working of that inward grace, of which baptiſm is the ſign and ſeal, all who partake of that grace, are but *meere patients*, and contribute no more to it, then a *childe* doth to its own begetting, and therefore *Infants* as fit Subjects to have it wrought in them as grown men, and the moſt grown men are in no more fitneſſe to receive this grace when it is given them, in reſpect either of any *faith* or *repentance*, which they *yet* have, then a very little childe, it being the primary intention of the Covenant of Grace, in its firſt work, to ſhew what Free Grace can and will do to miſerable nothing, to cut miſerable man *off from the wilde Olive*, and graffe him into the true Olive, *to take away the heart of ſtone, to create in them a heart of fleſh, to forgive their iniquities, to love them freely*, what doth the moſt grown man in any of theſe, more then an Infant may do? being *only paſſive* in them all; and of this *firſt* grace is the Sacrament of baptiſm properly a ſeal: and who ever will deny, that *Infants* are capable of theſe things as well as *grown men*; muſt deny that any Infants dying in their Infancy are ſaved by Chriſt.

Mat 3. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 27. Titus 3. 5. Mark. 1. 3.

Againſt this argument ſeverall things are objected: which I ſhall indevour to remove out of the way.

Firſt, It is ſaid, that although Infants are capable of theſe things, and they no doubt are by Chriſt wrought in many Infants, yet may not we baptize them, becauſe, ac- *Object.* 1.

cording to the Scripture pattern, both of *Christs command, Mat.* 28. in his *institution* of Baptisin, where this was injoyned; and *John* the Baptist, Christs Disciples, and Apostles, They alwayes taught and made them Disciples by teaching, before they baptized any.

Answ. I answer, First, that of *Matth.* 28. is not the *institution* of Baptism, it was instituted long before, to be the Seale of the Covenant; it is only an inlargement of their Commission, whereas before they were to goe *onely to the lost sheepe of the house of Israel*, now they were to *go unto all the world*. And beside, it is no where said, *that none were baptized*, but such as were *first taught*, and what reason wee have to beleeve the contrary, you have before seen.

Secondly, It is said indeed, that they taught and baptized, and no expresse mention made of any other: but the reason is plain, there was a new Church to be constituted, all the Jews who should receive Christ, were to come under *another administration*, and their Infants were to come in only *in their right*, and the Heathen Nations who were to be converted to Christ, were yet wholly without the Covenant of Grace, and their children could have no right untill themselves were brought in; and therefore no marvaile, though both *John*, and Christs Disciples, and Apostles, did teach before they baptized, because *then* no other were capable of baptism: but when once themselves were instructed and baptized, *then* their children were capable of it, by vertue of the Covenant. If any in the Jewish Church had received Commission, to go and make other Cities, *Proselytes* to them, their Commission must have run thus, *Go teach and circumcise*, would it therefore have followed, that none might bee circumcised, but such as were first taught?

Object. 2. But it is expresly said, *That hee that beleeves and is baptized, shall bee saved*; *Faith in Christ* is the Condition, upon which

which men may be baptized: and this is the moſt *common* objection among the *Anabaptiſts*: *Unbeleevers may not bee baptized, children are unbeleevers, therefore they may not bee baptized.* We have, ſay they, cleare evidence, that *Faith* is a condition required in thoſe that are to be baptized, no evidence of *any other* condition that makes them capable of Baptiſm. Others of them adde, that under an affirmative command, the negative is to bee included, beleeving is the affirmative, unbeleeving is the negative, therefore where beleevers are commanded to bee baptized, unbeleevers are forbidden to be baptized: this objection they much glory in, and ſome of them dare all the world to anſwer it.

Anſw. I Anſwer firſt, but if this argument have any ſtrength at all againſt the *Baptizing* of Infants, it hath much more ſtrength againſt the *ſalvation* of Infants; it is ſaid *expreſly* he that *beleeveth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*; *but he that beleeveth not, ſhall bee damned*: there ye have both the *negative* and *affirmative* ſet down; Hee that beleeves ſhall bee ſaved, hee that beleeves not ſhall bee damned; now I frame their own Argument thus, againſt the *ſalvation* of Infants, *All unbeleevers ſhall bee damned, all Infants are unbeleevers, therefore they ſhall bee damned*; now look at what doore they will goe out, for the *ſalvation* of infants, at the ſame will we go out, for the *baptizing* of infants; how ever they will evade the *one*, we ſhall much more ſtrongly evade the *other*; if they ſay this Text is meant of *grown men*, of the way which God takes for the *ſalvation* of grown men; *Infants* are ſaved another way, upon other conditions; the ſame ſay we of infants baptiſm, the Text means of the condition of baptizing of grown men, infants are baptized upon other conditions; if they ſay, infants though they cannot have *actuall* Faith, they may have *virtuall* Faith, Faith in the *ſeed and roote*, the ſame ſay we; if they ſay, though Infants have not Faith, yet they may have that which is Mark. 16. 16

Analogous to faith, the ſame ſay we, they have ſomwhat which hath *analogie* to faith, and as effectuall to make them capable of baptiſm, as of ſalvation.

Secondly, I anſwer, *it is no where ſaid unbeleevers,* (or rather *Non-beleevers* it ſhould be ſaid) *may not bee baptized*; it is ſaid indeed, *Hee that beleeveth and is baptized, ſhall bee ſaved*; and it is ſaid, *That he that beleeveth with all his heart, may* be baptized; it is no where ſaid, that he *that beleeveth not, may not be baptized:* Therefore I deny the conſequence, if all *beleevers* muſt be baptized, then no *unbeleevers*, or *non-beleevers* may be baptized; theſe two are not here intended by way of oppoſition, Chriſt excludes *Infants* neither from baptiſm, nor from ſalvation for want of Faith, but *poſitive unbeleevers*, and ſuch as refuſe the Goſpel he excludes from both: The ſtone upon which theſe men ſtumble, is the ignorance in the oppoſition in the Scripture they bring, which is not between *Beleevers*, and *their Children*, but between *them*, and *unbeleeving and profane perſons*, who are ſhut from the Lords Covenant, *Baptiſm*, and *Salvation.*

Obiect. 3. But ſuppoſe they are capable of the inward grace of baptiſme, and that God doth *effectually* work it in *ſome* of the Infants of *beleevers*, is that ſufficient warrant for us to baptize *all* the Infants of *Beleevers?* If we *knew* in what Infants the Lord did work *this*, we might baptize *thoſe* Infants, ſay *ſome of them*, but *that* he doth not make known to us, we cannot know of any *one* Infant by any ordinary way of knowledge, that they are inwardly baptized with the Holy Ghoſt; and therefore we may not baptize any of them, but wait to ſee *when* and in *whom* God will work the *thing ſignifyed*, and then apply the *ſign* to them.

Anſw. *Anſwer.* Our knowledge that God hath effectually wrought the thing ſignifyed, is not the *condition* upon which we are to apply the ſigne, God no where requires that we ſhould

ſhould know that they are inwardly and certainly converted, whom we admit to the Sacrament of Baptiſm; the Apoſtles themſelves were not required to know *this* of thoſe whom *they* baptized, if they were, they ſinned in baptizing *Simon Magus*, *Alexander*, *Hymenæus*, *Ananias* and *Saphira*, with others: we are indeed required to know that they have in them *that condition* which muſt warrant us to *adminiſter the ſign*, not *that* which makes them *poſſeſt of the thing ſignified*; *fallible conjectures* are not to be our rule in adminiſtring of Sacraments, either to Infants or grown men, but a *known rule of the word*, out of which rule we muſt be able to make up ſuch a judgement, that our adminiſtration may be of *faith*, as well as out of *charity*: In baptizing of grown men, the Apoſtles and Miniſters of Chriſt adminiſtred the ſigne, not becauſe they *conjectured* that the parties were *inwardly* ſanctifyed, but becauſe they made that *profeſſion* of faith and holineſſe of which they were *ſure*, that whoever had the thing in truth, were received by Chriſt into *inward* Communion with himſelf, and that whoever *thus* made it, that Chriſt would have them *received* into the communion of his Church, though poſſibly for want of the inward work they were never received into the *inward* communion with Jeſus Chriſt: indeed when ſuch a confeſſion was made, chriſtian *charity* which always hopeth the beſt, and thinketh no evill, bound them to receive them, and think of them, and converſe with them, as with men in whom the inward work was wrought, untill they gave ſignes to the contrary; but this their *charity*, or charitable conjecture was not the *ground* of their *admitting* them to the Ordinance, but the profeſſion and confeſſion of the party, made according to the Word, which they were bound to *reſt* in; yea, I greatly queſtion, whether in caſe *Peter* or *Paul* could by the ſpirit of revelation have known that *Ananias* or *Alexander* would have proved no better then hypocrites, whether they either

004
48

would, or ought to have refused them from Baptism, whilst they made that *publike profession and confession*, upon which others were admitted who in the event proved no better then those were. So that I conclude: not our *knowledge* of their *inward Sanctification*, is requisite to the admitting of any to baptism, but *our knowledge of the will of Christ*, that such who are in such and such condition, should by us be received into the communion of the Church: and in this the rule to direct our knowledge, is as plain for *Infants*, as for *grown men*, the rule having been always *this*, That *grown men, who were strangers from the Covenant of God*, Unbeleevers, Pagans, Heathens, should upon *their being instructed, and upon profession of their Faith, and promise to walk according to the rule of the Covenant*; be received and added to the Church, and made partakers of the seale of their entrance, and their *Infants to come in with them*; both sorts upon their admission to be charitably hoped of, untill they give signes to the contrary, charity being bound from thinking of evill of them, not tyed to conclude certainly of any of them, because they ought to know that in all ages, *all are not Israel who are of Israel*, and *that many are called, but few are chosen.*

Object. 4. But all who enter into *Covenant*, and receive the seale of the Covenant, must *stipulate* for *their parts*, as well as *God* doth for *his*, they must *indent* with God to perform the *beleevers* part of the Covenant, as well as God doth to perform *his part*, as even *this* Text, 1 *Pet.* 3. requires, That Baptism which saves us must have *the answer of a good conscience to God*: now although it be granted, that Infants are capable of receiving the *first* grace, if God be pleased to work it in *them*; yet what answer of a good conscience can there be from Infants unto God? they having not the use of Reason, and not knowing what the Covenant means?

1 Pet. 3. 21.

Answ.

Anſw. The Infants of the *Jews* were as much tyed as the *Infants* of *beleevers* under the Goſpel, every one who was circumciſed was *bound to keep the Law*, *Gal.* 5. and theſe men profeſſe that *Iſraelitiſh* Infants *were within the old Covenant*, when yet they knew not what it meant, nor could have the *ſame* uſe of it with their Parents and others of diſcretion. Look what anſwer they will make for the *Jews* infants, if true, will abundantly ſatisfie for the Infants of *beleevers* under the Goſpel. *Anſw.*

Secondly, God ſeales to them preſently, their name is put into the *deed*, and when they come to years of diſcretion, to be *adulti*, then in their own perſons they ſtand obliged to the performance of it; in the mean time *Jeſus Chriſt*, who is the ſurety of the Covenant, and the ſurety of all the Covenanters, is pleaſed to be their ſurety; we know when ſeverall parties ſtand obliged in the ſame bond, they may ſeale at ſeverall times, and yet be in force afterward together; or even a childe ſealing in infancy, may *agnize* and *recognize* that ſealing, when they come to years of diſcretion; if then they will renounce it, as done when they underſtood not, they may free themſelves if they pleaſe, if they finde the former act an inconvenience or burden to them: ſo is it here, God of his infinite mercy is pleaſed to ſeale to Infants while they are ſuch, and accepts of ſuch a ſeale on their parts, as they are able to give in their Infant age, expecting a further ratification on their part, when they are come to riper years, in the mean time affording them the favour and priviledge of being in Covenant with him, of being reckoned unto his kingdom and family, rather then of the Devils; if when they are grown men they refuſe to ſtand to this Covenant, there is no hurt done on Gods part, let them ſerve another God, and take their portion in the time to come. Heb. 7. 22.

But what benefit comes to children by *ſuch* kinde of ſea- *Object.* 5.

ling

ling as this is? it seems then (say they) by your own confession, that this is but a *conditionall sealing* on Gods part, *viz.* that they own it, and ratifie it when they come to age, and if they then refuse to stand to it, all is then nullifyed, were it not therefore better to defer it to their years of discretion, to see whether they will *then* make it their own voluntary act, yea, or no?

Answer. Answ. 1. This objection lay as strongly against Gods wisdome in requiring the *Jewes* Infants, even in their Infancy thus to seale; and therefore argues no great wisdom or modesty in men, who would thus reason with God about his administrations. 2. God hath other ends and uses of applying the seale of the Covenant to them who are in Covenant with him, then their *present gain*, it's a *Homage*, *Worship*, and *Honour* to himself, and it behoves us even in that respect, *to fulfill all righteousnesse: when Christ was baptized and circumcised*, he was unfit for the Ordinance, through his *perfection*, as Children through their *imperfection*, being as much *above them*, as Children are *below them*.

3. I Answer; The benefit and fruit of it at the present is very much, both to the *Parents* and to the *children*; to the Parents first, whilst God doth hereby honour them to have their children counted to his Church, to his Kingdom, and Family, to be under his wing and grace, whileſt all the other Infants in the world have their visible standing under the Prince, and in the kingdom of darkness, and consequently whileſt others have no hope of their childrens spiritual welfare, untill they be called out of that condition, these need not have any doubt of their childrens welfare, if they dye in their *Infancy*, nor if they live untill they shew signes to the contrary: God having both *reckoned* them unto *his people*, and given them *all the meanes of salvation*, which an *Infants* age is capable of.

Second-

Secondly, here is much priviledge and benefit to the children, when as (beſide what inward ſecret work God is pleaſed to work in them) they being Members of the Church of Chriſt have their ſhare in the Communion of Saints, are remembred at the throne of Grace, every day by thoſe that pray for the welfare of the Church, and particularly in thoſe prayers which are made for his bleſſing upon his Ordinances.

And laſtly, it's no ſmall priviſedge to have that Seale beſtowed upon thē in their *Infancy*, which they may *afterwards* plead when they are *grown* and come to *fulfill the condition.* *Object.6.*

But if their being capable of the ſpirituall part, muſt intitle them to the outward ſign, why then doe we not alſo admit them to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is the ſeal of the *Covenant of Grace*, as well as the Sacrament of Baptiſm? And this is urged the rather, becauſe (ſay they) the *Infants* of the *Jewes* did eate of the *Paſſeover*, as well as were circumciſed; now if *our* Infants have every way as large a priviledge as the *Infants* of the *Jews* had, then can wee not deny them the ſame priviledge which their *Infants* had, and conſequently they muſt partake of the one Sacrament, as well as the other.

I anſwer, that Infants are capable of the grace of *Baptiſme*, we are ſure, not ſure that they are capaple of the grace ſigned and ſealed in the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*: for though both of them are ſeales of the New Covenant, yet it is with ſome difference; Baptiſme properly ſeales the *entrance into it*, the Lords Supper, properly the *growth, nouriſhment* and *augmentation of it*; Baptiſm for our *birth*, the Lords Supper for our *food*; now Infants may bee *born* again while they are Infants, have their *Originall* ſin pardoned, bee *united* to Chriſt, have his *Image* ſtampt upon them, but concerning the *exerciſe* of theſe graces and the *augmentation* of them in Infants, while they are Infants, *Anſw.*

the Scripture is altogether ſilent, and for what is ſaid concerning the Infants of the *Jewes* eating the *Paſſeover*, to which our Sacrament of the Lords Supper doth ſucceed, there is no ſuch thing mentioned in all the Book of God; it is ſaid indeed that the ſeverall families were to eate their Lambe, if the houſehold were not too little for it, and that when their children ſhould ask them what that ſervice meant, they ſhould inſtruct them about the meaning of it; but no *word injoyning*, nor any *example* witneſſing, that their little children did eat of it. If they ſay (as ſome of them doe) that *thoſe* little ones, who were able to *enquire concerning the meaning* of that ſervice, and capable to receive inſtruction about it, did eat of the Paſſeover with their Parents; I anſwer, (although the Scripture ſpeaks nothing of their eating, yet if that be granted) it is no prejudice to us, becauſe the Goſpel prohibites not *ſuch* yong ones from the Lords Supper, who are *able to examine themſelves, aud diſcerne the Lords Body.*

Exod. 12. 3, 4. 6, 27.

Cor. 11.

Thus have I according to my poor ability made good this ſecond argument alſo, and vindicated it from all objections of any weight which I have met withall to the contrary, it remains that I winde up all, with a briefe Application.

Application. First, for reproofe of the Anabaptiſts.

And firſt it ſerves for juſt reproofe of the Anabaptiſts, and all ſuch as by their raſh and bloody ſentence condemn Infants, as out of the ſtate of Grace; it's a great ſinne to paſſe ſentence upon any particular perſon for any one act, as was that of *Eli*, concerning *Hannah*, how much more heinous is it to condemne all the Infants of the whole Church of Chriſt, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, or the ſeale of it? Wee read of *Herod* the Tyrant, that he deſtroyed all the children in *Bethlehem*, and the Coaſts thereof from two years old and under; is not this a farre more cruell ſentence, to ſet theſe in no better ſtate then Pagans and Infidels, *Without Chriſt, aliens*

Sam. 1.

Mat. 2. 16.

Ephes. 2. 12.

from

from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, as ſtrangers from the Covenant of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world? Can any ſober Chriſtian think this a ſmall fault? Our bleſſed Saviour ſaith, *It is not lawfull to take the Childrens bread and give it to dogs*, but theſe men take *Children*, and in their judgement, conclude them for no better then *dogs*; *baptiſm* is the bread of the Lord, which he would have given to his children, and to deny it to them as none of their right, is to make them no better then *dogs*. The Prophet *Eliſha* wept when he looked upon *Haẓael*, becauſe he foreſaw that he would daſh the infants of *Iſrael* againſt the wall, and even *Haẓael* thought himſelf worthy to be eſteemed a *dog* if ever he ſhould do ſuch a thing. But certainly, thus to daſh all Infant children of *beleevers* out of the Covenant of Grace, (as much as in them lyeth) & to deprive them of the ſeale of it, is in a ſpirituall ſenſe farre more heavy. And I dare appeale to the tender bowels of any beleeving Parents, whether it were not eaſier for them to think that their *Infants* ſhould be daſhed againſt the ſtones, and yet in the mean time to die under Chriſts *wing*, as viſible Members of his Kingdome, Church and Family, rather then to have them live, and behold them to have a viſible ſtanding *only* in the Kingdom of the Devill: Theſe men know not how much they provoke Chriſts diſpleaſure againſt themſelves; Hee was greatly diſpleaſed with his own Diſciples for forbidding litle children to come unto him; and one day ſuch men will know, that he is much more diſpleaſed with them, who with ſo great violence oppoſe the bringing of beleevers children unto his holy Sacrament, that with unſpeakable wrong, injury, and ſlander, they proſecute all the Miniſters of Chriſt, who give *Infants* this their due, condemning them for Miniſters of Antichriſt, and limbes of the Beaſt; yea, ſome of them proceeding ſo farre, as condemning all the Churches of Chriſt, to bee no Chur-

ches, who caſt not their children out of the Covenant of Grace, and the ſeale of it, and doe cry out upon the Baptizing of *Infants*, as one of thoſe great ſinnes which bring and continue all our judgements upon us. The Apoſtate Emperour *Julian* is juſtly cryed out upon for his cruelty againſt the Chriſtians, for denying to their *bodies* humane Sepulture; how much more cruell is it to deny to the ſouls of *Infants* the juſt priviledge and benefit of the Covenant of Grace? We know he did it out of hatred to Chriſtianity, which I am farre from charging upon theſe men; but if we compare the ſentence and fact of the one with the other, we ſhall finde the latter (bee their principle what it will) farre more injurious to the Church of Chriſt then the other: The Lord in mercy give them to ſee how unjuſt that ſentence, and how heavy that doom is, which they thus paſſe, not only upon Infant children, but upon all the Churches of Chriſt; and ſeriouſly to conſider, whether the Lord, who once in his diſpleaſure threatned to daſh their Infants againſt the Stones, who had daſht the Infants of the children of *Iſrael* againſt the ſtones, will indure it at the hands of any to expunge the Seed of the faithfull out of his Covenant, and to drive them from his City and Kingdom after this cruell manner.

Pſal. 131.8,9.

Uſe 2. To Parents. For their comfort.

Secondly, how much may this comfort the Soule of every beleeving Parent, to behold this great love and goodneſſe of God in his Covenant of Grace to them and their poſterity, that not only themſelves, but even their Infants for their ſakes, ſhould be reckoned to the houſehold of God, put into the Ark, wrapped up in a Covenant of Love, brought under the wing of God? When God had promiſed to *David*, that hee ſhould have a Son to whom God would bee a Father, and that all his poſterity ſhould after ſuch a gracious manner be regarded, his heart was even raviſhed with it, *O Lord God* (ſaid hee) *what am I, and what is my*

houſe,

house, that thou hast brought mee hitherto? and this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God, but thou hast spoken also of thy servants house for a great while to come, and is this the manner of men, O Lord God? And even so should Christian Parents break out into admiration of his goodnesse, in taking their children into that gracious Covenant, which is not onely the womb and vessell, but also the well-head of so many mercies, which are terminated, not in themselves, but flow down to their posterity from generation to generation. 2 Sam. 7.

And this is yet more admirable in our eyes, when wee seriously consider, how unclean and filthy, how viperous a brood they are, as proceeding out of our loines, empty of all goodnesse, full of all wickednesse, an unclean Leprosie having bespread them from the crown of the Head to the sole of the Foot, fit onely to bee cast into the open Field, to the loathing of their persons, in the day that they are born, as all the rest of the world are; and that God should set his heart upon such as these, to take them thus neere unto Himself, when he passes by both Parents and Infants of all the world beside, how would our hearts melt in his praises, if wee could consider these things? Esa. 16. Ezek. 16.

2. How should this ingage all Christian Parents to look to the education of their children, to bring them up in the nurture and fear of the Lord? Its a wofull thing to consider the *wretched carelesnesse* of many Parents; yea, not onely carelesnesse, but *ungodlinesse* of many Parents; who prostitute their children to the *Devill* and his service, after they have *consecrated* them to *Christ* by baptism; train them up in ignorance, profaneness, &c. To whom God may say, as hee did to that Harlot, *Ezek. 16. Thou hast taken my Sons and my Daughters, whom thou hast born unto mee, and these thou hast sacrificed unto Devils.* A generation of wretched men, who take more care of their *Hogs* and *Dogs*, then they doe

2. For their ... to provok... to be asha... for their ... lesnesse, &... time past. Ezek. 16. Psal. 106.

of

of their *Infants* immortall ſoules, nouriſhing the former, murdering the latter; that, we may ſay of them, as *Auguſtus* did of *Herod*, that it is *better to bee Herods Hog then his Son.* I have often heard a ſad Story of a wretched Woman, who perſwaded her Daughter to yeeld to the luſt of a rich man, in hope he would marry her, as hee had promiſed to doo; which ſhe did, and preſently after fell ſick and dyed; The wretched mother hereupon grew diſtracted, and in her madneſſe cryed out, *O my Daughters ſoule, my Daughters ſoule, I have damned my Daughters ſoule*: Verily, thus may many Parents cry out upon themſelves for murthering their Childrens ſoules; and their Children may wiſh that they had been either Dogges, or Swine, rather then their Sons or Daughters; miſerable children, of miſerable Parents! what will ſuch Parents anſwer God, when hee comes to demand his children of them? Suppoſed a Prince or Noble man ſhould put a Childe to Nurſe unto ſome mean man, and pay them well for the education of it; or rather ſuppoſe a great man ſhould adopt the child of a poor man to be his own, and ſhould ſay unto this poore man, as *Pharaohs* daughter ſaid to *Moſes mother*, *Bring up this Childe for me, and I will give thee thy wages*; and afterward comming to ſee this childe, ſhould find they had lamed the childe, and taught it nothing but to ſpeak evill of them, and to fight against them: I think I pray you what they would ſay, or doo to this wretched man. How much more abominable is the ſin of many Parents, who by their own careleſneſſe, and vile example, leaven their children with principles, and lead them in wayes quite contrary to the Covenant of grace, tending to nothing, but to diſhonour God, and to their own deſtruction. If any of you have been guilty of it in time paſt, be deeply humbled for it, crave mercy and pardon; and for time to come, indeavour to doe the part of a *nurſing Father* or *Mother* for Chriſt, looking upon thy

od. 2.19.

d to nurſe
n up for
iſt in time
come.

ying for
m.

thy children, as being Christs more then thine, yea, as not being thine, but Christs, to whom thou hast consecrated them, and therefore (as wise and loving Nurses use to doe) carry them often to their Father for his blessing, and hee will blesse them, and reward thee *also*; we finde in the second of *Joel*, that in the day of their Fast, they were to *bring their children and set them before the Lord*, that hee might bee moved to compassion for the Childrens sake, whom hee used to call his own; set thou thy Children often before him, intreate him as *Joseph* did his *father* for his two sonnes, and as they did our Saviour, *Mark.*10. that *hee would put his hands upon them and blesse them*; Doe it heartily, humbly, frequently, tell him how deare they are to thee, and the dearer, because he is pleased to own them, tell him their wants, and thy own inability to supply them in any thing, and how easie it is for him to doe it by his Spirit and Grace; *Oh that Ishmael might live in thy sight*, said *Abraham*; Say thou so also, Lord let these children live before thee, *thine they are, and thou gavest them mee to bring up for thee, Oh blesse my labour among them, and make them such as thou wouldest have them to bee.* Joel 2,16.

And doe not onely pray for them, but *discipline them and instruct them*, acquainting them with the Scriptures, and Catechising them in the Principles of Religion; as the Mother and Grandmother of *Timothy* did him, *Training him up from his infancy, in the knowledge of the holy Scripture*; and bee assured, if thy children may learn from thee to *know* their heavenly Father, to *beleeve* in him, to *love* him, and *feare* him betimes, *that being taught the trade in their youth, they may not forsake it when they are old*: they will then more blesse God for thee, then if thou couldest leave them all the world for their inheritance; it was for *this* that *Solomon* gloried in *his* father and mother, *Prov.* 4. 2,3. and for *this* 2 Tim.1.5.3. 15. Prov. 4.2,3.

this will thy children *riſe up and call thee bleſſed.* Thus ſhalt thou approve thy ſelf a true ſon of *Abraham*; Thus ſhall thy children be bleſſed with faithfull *Abraham*; Thus ſhall the Covenant, the ſpirituall part and benefit of it, *as* well as the outward, reſt upon thy poſterity from generation to generation.

3. To all baptized ones.

Thirdly, and laſtly, This ſerves for uſe to all children whom God honours ſo farre, as in their *Infancy* to bring thus near unto himſelf, and to uſe them thus as his owne, and that three ſeverall wayes; First, to *incourage* and *comfort* them to beleeve in him, and reſt upon him, for all the good things which hee hath promiſed in the Covenant of Grace. The Papiſts, as in ſome things they give and aſcribe too much to Baptiſme, making it to take away originall ſinne, *ex opere operato*: So in other things they rob Gods people of the comfortable uſe *of it*, becauſe they ſay that when once wee commit actuall ſinnes wee make ſhipwrack of Baptiſm, and then *Penance* muſt bee *ſecunda tabula poſt naufragium*, a Cockboat after our ſhipwrack; but this bleſſed Sacrament ſerves for a more durable and comfortable uſe, even to bee an *Ark*, as my Text cals it, to carry to Heaven. Know then that whenſoever thou findeſt thy ſelf at a loſſe, ſenſible of thy undone condition, findeſt thy guilt, and filth, and bondage, through ſinne, and flyeſt unto Chriſt, and thy Conſcience witneſſeth with thee, that thou wouldeſt walk for time to come, according to the rule of the Covenant, in uprightneſſe, to make God in Chriſt thy portion, and his word thy guide; So *often* I ſay, as thou doeſt this, mayeſt thou fly to thy *Baptiſme*, and plead it for thy comfort, as wee may plead the *Rainbow* in foule weather againſt the worlds deſtruction by water. I have often heard a ſtory of a great Queen, who gave a Ring to a Nobleman, while hee was her Favourite, and willed him to ſend it to her when hee ſhould ſtand in great-

1. For comfort when they beleeve and repent.

greateſt need of her favour; who afterward falling into her diſpleaſure, ſent the Ring, which through the treachery of the bearer was not delivered till it was too late: But it ſhall never happen ſo to *thee*, doe thou in all thy extremity, ſhew or ſend by the hand of faith thy *Seale*, which God hath given thee, plead it confidently, and to thy dying day, it may be an Ark unto thy ſoule in all caſes of *relapſe*, *deſertion*, *temptation*, or whatever elſe may betide thee, upon the renewing of thy repentance and faith in Chriſt Jeſus.

2. To humble ſuch as walk unworthy o this privile

Secondly, This great love of God in taking us thus neare into his own Family, as his own Children, ſhould make many of us bluſh, *to remember our unworthy converſation, in times paſt*; yea, it might make our very *hearts to bleed*, and make us not only wiſh we had been *unbaptized*, but even *unborn*, rather then to pollute the holy Covenant, and the ſeale of it, as we have done with our unhallowed lives: Can it ſeem a light thing in our eyes, that when God hath left the greateſt part of the world, as ſtrangers from his Family and Kingdom, to be under Satans kingdom, and taken us (no better by nature than they are) to be his peculiar ones, into Covenant with him, that hee ſhould ſwear unto us, to be our God, and hitherto to train us up under ſuch heavenly Ordinances, and we to walk in the mean time as rebels and enemies unto him, like the unbaptized world? can we think our condemnation not to be greater then theirs? Let me a little reaſon the caſe with you, Doe you know into what a Covenant the Lord hath taken you? what he hath done for you, and expects from you? have not your Miniſters and Parents inſtructed you in it? Now tell me what is the reaſon of your unanſwerable converſation, is it becauſe you renounce the Covenant, as being made when you underſtood it not? if ſo, that you do indeed renounce it, *Take your courſe, ſerve the God you have choſen*, yet tell mee (I beſeech you) what iniquity is in the

Lords Covenant? what hurt is there in it? what disadvantage have you met withall? or *where* and *how* doe you hope to finde better things, then *God to be your Father, Christ Jesus to bee your Saviour*, the *Spirit to bee your Comforter?* to have *your sins pardoned and healed*, to be *adopted, justifyed, sanctifyed*, and every way *comfortably provided for here*, and *saved for ever?* Doe the Gods you have chosen to serve, provide better things then these, that you renounce Christ for their sakes? If you say, God forbid you should renounce Christ; No, you hope to bee saved by Christ, as well as any other: Then tell me in good sadnesse, doe you expect that Christ should stand bound to perform *his part* of the Covenant, and you left at liberty for *your* part? that he should *love you*, and *you hate him?* that *he* should bee your God, and *you* remain the Devils servant? that *he* should provide Heaven for you, and *you* walk in the way which leads to hell? O how much are you deceived! I tell you he hath sworn the contrary, he hath heaped up tribulation and wrath for every soule which doth evill, for the *Jew first*, for the *baptized first*; and you will one day finde, that *it had been better you had never lived in his house, nor been trained up under his Covenant, then thus to profane it, and make the blood of it, as an unholy thing.*

3. To provoke to holy life for time to come.

Thirdly, this great priviledge should ingage us all for time to come, to make our Baptisme a continuall motive to an answerable conversation to live as men who are dead unto sin, and alive unto God; to account that it ought to bee as strange, to see a baptized man walk in a sinfull course, as to see a *Spectrum*, a walking Ghost. *We are buryed with Christ in Baptisme; and how can wee who are dead to sinne live any longer therein?* We are planted into his family, made his Children, have his Spirit dwelling in us, yea, thereby made one with Christ. *All this*, we lay claim to, by our Baptism, shall not this inforce us to live answerably?

Col. 2. 12.

rably? *Luther* tels a Story of a gracious Virgin, who uſed to get the victory over Satan when he tempted her to any ſinne, *Satan I may not doe it*, Baptizata ſum, *I am Baptized*, and muſt walk accordingly: So ſhould we argue, Let baſe perſons live baſely, noble and generous men muſt live nobly; let Turks and Pagans live wickedly, the holy ſeed muſt live holily and righteouſly: keepe it daily in thy thoughts, what thy Baptiſm ingageth thee unto, and that if thou walk otherwiſe, it will riſe up extreamly to aggravate thy condemnation in the laſt day. It was a cuſtome in the latter end of the Primitive times, That ſuch as were baptized, did weare a white Stole (a humane Ceremony, to ſignifie their purity of life which the baptized was to lead, *Fulgentes animas veſtis quoque candida ſignat.*) Now there was one *Elpidophorus*, who after his baptiſm turned a perſecutor; *Muritta* the Miniſter who baptized him, brought forth in publick the white Stole which *Elpidophorus* had worn at his Baptiſm, and cryed unto him; *O* Elpidophorus! *this Stole doe I keep againſt thy comming to Judgement, to teſtifie thy Apoſtaſie from Chriſt*; doe thou in like manner aſſure thy ſelf, the very Font wherein thou waſt baptized, the Regiſter wherein thy name is recorded, will riſe up againſt thee, if thou lead not a holy life: The Covenant is holy, the Seale is holy, let theſe provoke thee to ſtudy to be holy, yea to draw holineſſe from them. Conſider what I ſay, *And the Lord give you underſtanding in all things.*

FINIS.

Library of the
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York